

# THE INTERPRETATION OF THE MIRACLES OF JESUS BY THE NEW TESTAMENT EVANGELISTS

James Lloyd Bailey

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD  
at the  
University of St Andrews



1967

Full metadata for this item is available in  
St Andrews Research Repository  
at:

<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

Please use this identifier to cite or link to this item:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10023/13658>

This item is protected by original copyright



THE INTERPRETATION OF THE MIRACLES OF JESUS  
BY THE NEW TESTAMENT EVANGELISTS

---

A Thesis  
Presented to  
the Senatus Academicus of  
the University of St. Andrews

---

In Application  
for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

---

by  
James Lloyd Bailey

March, 1967



ProQuest Number: 10166611

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10166611

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

Tn 5456

### DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the following thesis is based upon the results of research carried out by me, that it is my own composition, and that it has not been presented previously for a higher degree.

The research was carried out in St. Mary's College of the University of St. Andrews under the direction of the Reverend Dr. Ernest Best.

James Lloyd Bailey

### CERTIFICATE

I certify that James Lloyd Bailey has fulfilled the requirements of Ordinance No. 16 (St. Andrews) and is qualified to submit the accompanying thesis in application for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy of the University of St. Andrews.

The Reverend Dr. Ernest Best  
Supervisor of Research

## ACADEMIC CAREER

I matriculated at the Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio in the autumn of 1956. In the following academic year I transferred to Capital University, Columbus, Ohio and after completing my studies with a concentration in social sciences was granted the degree of Bachelor of Arts in June of 1960.

In the autumn of that year I matriculated at the Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary, Columbus, Ohio and in the spring of 1964 was granted the degree of Bachelor of Divinity.

In October of 1964 I matriculated at the University of St. Andrews and commenced my research at St. Mary's College. The thesis now being presented is the record of that research.

## PREFACE

When I embarked upon my study of the Gospel miracle stories, I did not fully realize the complexity of New Testament research. I am indebted to the staff members of the New Testament department at St. Mary's College for assisting me in seeing more clearly the breadth and depth of this area. I am particularly appreciative of the help given me by my supervisor, Dr. Ernest Best, who has freely offered his time in consultation and in reading and criticizing my work. I also wish to thank Principal Matthew Black and Dr. R. McL. Wilson of the New Testament department and Mr. Robert Davidson of the Old Testament department, whose lectures and seminars have proved to be informative and whose counsel was given whenever I sought it. In addition, the secretaries of St. Mary's College, particularly Miss M. Blackwood, and the personnel of the University Library have been extremely helpful. Finally, as the dedication of this volume indicates, my wife has not only continually encouraged me in my efforts during these past two and one-

half years but also has spent much time typing the final copy of the manuscript and proof-reading it.

When quoting the Greek text I have used Nestle-Aland's Novum Testamentum Graece (25th ed., 1963) although since its publication in 1966 I have found The Greek New Testament (ed. K. Aland, M. Black, B.M. Metzger, and A. Wikgren), produced under the auspices of the various national Bible societies, to be an invaluable tool. Unless otherwise noted, all English quotations of the Bible included in this thesis follow the wording of the Revised Standard Version (rev., 1946-1952).

I was unable to make use of A. Fridrichsen's Le Problème du miracle dans le Christianisme primitif (Strassbourg and Paris, 1925) since it was unavailable to me, and R. Schnackenburg's Das Johannesevangelium, Part 1 on chapters 1-4 ("Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, Band 4"; Freiburg, 1965) arrived in the University Library after the final manuscript of my thesis had been typed.



To my wife

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE . . . . .	v
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS . . . . .	viii
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Chapter	
I. THE MIRACLE STORIES IN MARK . . . . .	6
Summary: Mark's Use of the Miracle Stories . . . . .	127
II. THE MIRACLE STORIES IN MATTHEW . . . . .	145
Summary: Matthew's Use of the Mira- cle Stories . . . . .	260
III. THE MIRACLE STORIES IN LUKE . . . . .	280
Summary: Luke's Use of the Miracle Stories . . . . .	377
IV. THE SIGNS IN JOHN . . . . .	395
Summary: John's Use of the Sign Narratives . . . . .	461
V. THE MIRACLE STORIES IN THE TRADITION PRIOR TO THE WRITTEN GOSPELS . . . . .	477
VI. CONCLUSION . . . . .	533
APPENDIX . . . . .	544
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	557
INDEX TO PRINCIPAL PASSAGES DISCUSSED . . . . .	578

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- Allen--Allen, W. C. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew.
- Barrett, John--Barrett, C. K. The Gospel according to St. John.
- Bernard--Bernard, J. H. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John, vols. 1 and 2.
- Best--Best, E. The Temptation and the Passion: The Markan Soteriology.
- Bonnard--Bonnard, P. L'Évangile selon Saint Matthieu.
- Branscomb--Branscomb, B. H. The Gospel of Mark.
- Brown--Brown, R. E. The Gospel according to John (i-xii).
- Bultmann, History--Bultmann, R. The History of the Synoptic Tradition.
- Bultmann, Johannes--Bultmann, R. Das Evangelium des Johannes.
- Burkill--Burkill, T. A. Mysterious Revelation.
- Caird--Caird, G. B. The Gospel of St. Luke.
- Conzelmann--Conzelmann, H. The Theology of St. Luke.
- Cranfield--Cranfield, C. E. B. The Gospel according to Saint Mark.
- Creed--Creed, J. M. The Gospel according to St. Luke.
- Dibelius--Dibelius, M. From Tradition to Gospel.

- Dodd, Hist. Tradition--Dodd, C. H. Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel.
- Dodd, Interpretation--Dodd, C. H. The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel.
- E.T.--The Expository Times.
- Fenton--Fenton, J. C. Saint Matthew.
- Filson--Filson, F. V. A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew.
- Fuller, Christology--Fuller, R. H. The Foundations of New Testament Christology.
- Fuller, Miracles--Fuller, R. H. Interpreting the Miracles.
- Gilmour, I.B., vol. 8--Gilmour, S. MacL. "The Gospel according to St. Luke," The Interpreter's Bible, vol. 8.
- Gould--Gould, E. P. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Mark.
- Grant, I.B., vol. 7--Grant, F. C. "The Gospel according to St. Mark," The Interpreter's Bible, vol. 7.
- Grundmann, Lukas--Grundmann, W. Das Evangelium nach Lukas.
- Grundmann, Markus--Grundmann, W. Das Evangelium nach Markus.
- Haenchen, Apg.--Haenchen, E. Die Apostelgeschichte.
- Haenchen, Der Weg--Haenchen, E. Der Weg Jesu.
- Hahn--Hahn, F. Christologische Hoheitstitel.
- Held--Bornkamm, G., Barth, G., and Held, H. J. Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew.
- Hoskyns--Hoskyns, E. C. The Fourth Gospel, vols. 1 and 2.
- Hoskyns and Davey--Hoskyns, E., and Davey, N. The Riddle of the New Testament.

Howard, I.B., vol. 8--Howard, W. F. "The Gospel according to St. John," The Interpreter's Bible, vol. 8.

I.B.D.--The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible.  
(ed. G. A. Buttrick).

J.B.L.--Journal of Biblical Literature.

Jeremias, Eucharistic Words--Jeremias, J. The Eucharistic Words of Jesus.

Jeremias, Promise to Nations--Jeremias, J. Jesus' Promise to the Nations.

Johnson, I.B., vol. 7--Johnson, S. E. "The Gospel according to St. Matthew," The Interpreter's Bible, vol. 7.

Johnson, Mark--Johnson, S. E. The Gospel according to St. Mark.

J.T.S.--Journal of Theological Studies.

Kilpatrick--Kilpatrick, G. D. The Origins of the Gospel according to St. Matthew.

Klostermann, Markus--Klostermann, E. Das Markus Evangelium.

Klostermann, Matthäus--Klostermann, E. Das Matthäusevangelium.

Knox--Knox, W. L. The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels, vol. 1.

Lagrange, Jean--Lagrange, M.-J. Évangile selon Saint Jean.

Lagrange, Luc--Lagrange, M.-J. Évangile selon Saint Luc.

Lagrange, Marc--Lagrange, M.-J. Évangile selon Saint Marc.

Lagrange, Matthieu--Lagrange, M.-J. Évangile selon Saint Matthieu.

Leaney--Leaney, A. R. C. A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke.

- Lightfoot, History--Lightfoot, R. H. History and Interpretation in the Gospels.
- Lightfoot, John--Lightfoot, R. H. St. John's Gospel: A Commentary.
- Lightfoot, Locality--Lightfoot, R. H. Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels.
- Lightfoot, Message--Lightfoot, R. H. The Gospel Message of St. Mark.
- Lohmeyer, Markus--Lohmeyer, E. Das Evangelium des Markus.
- Lohmeyer, Matthäus--Lohmeyer, E., and Schmauch, W. Das Evangelium des Matthäus.
- Loisy, Évangiles Synoptiques--Loisy, A. Les Évangiles Synoptiques, vols. 1 and 2.
- Loisy, Quatrième Évangile--Loisy, A. Le Quatrième Évangile.
- Van der Loos--Loos, H. van der. The Miracles of Jesus.
- MacGregor--MacGregor, G. H. C. The Gospel of John.
- McNeile--McNeile, A. H. The Gospel according to St. Matthew.
- Manson, Js. the Messiah--Manson, W. Jesus the Messiah.
- Manson, Luke--Manson, W. The Gospel of Luke.
- Marxsen--Marxsen, W. Der Evangelist Markus.
- Nineham--Nineham, D. E. Saint Mark.
- N.T.--Novum Testamentum.
- N.T.S.--New Testament Studies.
- Peake's--Peake's Commentary on the Bible. (ed. M. Black and H. H. Rowley).
- Plummer--Plummer, A. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Luke.

- Rawlinson--Rawlinson, A. E. J. The Gospel according to St. Mark.
- Rengstorff--Rengstorff, K. H. Das Evangelium nach Lukas.
- Richardson--Richardson, A. The Miracle-Stories of the Gospels.
- J. M. Robinson--Robinson, J. M. The Problem of History in Mark.
- T. H. Robinson--Robinson, T. H. The Gospel of Matthew.
- Schlatter--Schlatter, A. Der Evangelist Matthäus.
- Schmidt--Schmidt, K. L. Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu.
- Schniewind, Markus--Schniewind, J. Das Evangelium nach Markus.
- Schniewind, Matthäus--Schniewind, J. Das Evangelium nach Matthäus.
- S.J.Th.--Scottish Journal of Theology.
- Strack-Billerbeck--Strack, H. L., and Billerbeck, P. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch.
- Strathmann--Strathmann, H. Das Evangelium nach Johannes.
- Strecker--Strecker, G. Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit.
- Streeter--Streeter, B. H. The Four Gospels.
- Taylor, Formation--Taylor, V. The Formation of the Gospel Tradition.
- Taylor, Mark--Taylor, V. The Gospel according to St. Mark.
- T.W.N.T.--Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.  
(ed. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich).
- Westcott--Westcott, B. F. The Gospel according to St. John, vols. 1 and 2.
- Z.N.W.--Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft.



## INTRODUCTION

It is no longer assumed that the New Testament Gospels present straightforward historical reports of the events in the earthly ministry of Jesus. Instead, it is now well established that these early documents are theologically conditioned, offering us the story about Jesus as interpreted in the light of the Church's faith. In the present day world where particularly the Gospel stories which recount the miracles performed by Jesus are largely disregarded it seems important to determine more precisely how these accounts were employed in the early Church.

In the following work we attempt to trace the interpretation of the miracles of Jesus in the New Testament. To do this adequately it is necessary to apply the form-critical method with particular attention given to the work done by the respective evangelists who were responsible for the final stage in the composition of the written Gospels.<sup>1</sup> This means that we are concerned to take

---

<sup>1</sup>Haenchen, Der Weg, p. 24, suggests that "Kompositionsgeschichte" is a more appropriate designation than "Redaktionsgeschichte" for this second stage of the "formgeschichtliche" method.



seriously the theological emphases of the different Gospel writers, especially in respect to their presentations of the material about the miracles of Jesus. In doing this, we are guided to some extent by the work of Held<sup>1</sup> on the miracle stories in Matthew. We apply a similar procedure to the miracle material in Mark, Luke and John. In view of the scope of this project it is not always possible to pursue certain items as far as would be desirable ideally; nonetheless, the primary aim of our study is to compare the varying theological viewpoints regarding the miracle stories in the New Testament Church. Most recently van der Loos has completed a study about the miracles of Jesus which is of encyclopedic dimensions, but he has not paid sufficient attention to the individual viewpoints of the evangelists. We would contend that work regarding the meaning of the Gospel miracle stories can only be advanced by taking into account their contributions.

We confine our study to an investigation of the Gospel material which describes the exorcisms, healings and other miraculous deeds accomplished by Jesus; therefore, we exclude from our consideration the birth narratives, the stories involving the post-Resurrection appearances of Jesus, and the accounts relating the miracles done by

---

<sup>1</sup>Pp. 165ff.

Jesus' apostles.

We take as our starting point the Gospel of Mark since it was eventually used as a source by both Matthew and Luke. When considering the miracle stories in Mark, we attempt whenever feasible to distinguish between the material as it came to the second evangelist and his redactional contributions which are frequently detectable at the juncture of two pericopae. In addition, it is important to observe the order in which the stories have been placed to see if this discloses the Markan purpose.

In the case of Matthew and Luke, our task is somewhat easier since we normally have before us a Markan text with which to compare the reworked version of a story. In addition, we are confronted in these Gospels with stories which were undoubtedly derived from sources other than Mark. After considering the Markan miracle stories in the first chapter of our study we then proceed to those in the Gospel of Matthew, noting the different manner in which the first evangelist has used them. In chapter three we follow the same pattern in our investigation of the miracle stories in Luke. Then in chapter four we attempt to determine the importance of "the signs" in the plan of the Gospel of John. In this instance, we cannot always be sure of the sources which John had at his disposal;

they may have been one or more of the Synoptics or he may have been wholly relying on an independent tradition.

After investigating the material in all four written Gospels, we endeavour to say something about the origin and form of the miracle stories in the tradition prior to the composition of these documents. Although it would have been possible to include this consideration of the earliest tradition as chapter one in our study, we choose to place it last since it is only on the basis of our work on the written Gospels that we can make any judgments about the earlier period.

We include a summary section at the end of each chapter, and then at the close of the entire study we draw together our conclusions. Finally, in an appendix we briefly indicate the tendencies evidenced in the transmission of material about Jesus' miracles in the apocryphal gospels of the second century.

Occasionally in our study we refer to the "typical features" of a miracle story. Although no pattern for the reporting of a miracle can be rigidly established, stories of this kind usually contain certain general characteristics: (a) the need for help is shown (e.g., the patient is brought to Jesus); (b) Jesus' assistance is requested directly or indirectly; (c) the condition of

the patient or the seriousness of the situation is described; (d) Jesus performs the miraculous deed by means of a word and/or an action; (e) the fact of the miracle is confirmed; and (f) the reaction of the witness or witnesses is mentioned.

Throughout this study, in designating the Gospels as the first Gospel (Matthew), the second Gospel (Mark), the third Gospel (Luke) and the fourth Gospel (John) we follow the order in the New Testament and do not intend this as a chronological sequence. Likewise, the Gospel writers are referred to in that order, i.e., Matthew as the first evangelist, Mark as the second evangelist, Luke as the third evangelist, and John as the fourth evangelist. Finally, our use of the names Matthew, Mark, Luke and John is intended to imply nothing regarding the authorship of the documents; however, we do assume that the Gospel of Luke and the book of Acts were composed by the same author.

## CHAPTER I

### THE MIRACLE STORIES IN MARK

#### The Casting out of the Unclean Spirit in the Synagogue--Mk. 1:21-28 (Lk. 4:31-37)

In 1:23-27 Mark has presented the first miracle story of his Gospel; it follows the narrative describing Jesus' call to the first disciples (1:16-20) and precedes the story of the healing of Simon's mother-in-law (1:29-31). As we shall see, it is significant that Mark's initial miracle story reports an exorcism accomplished by Jesus.

Since Mk. 1:21-39 exhibits a certain consistency in its temporal and geographical references, some exegeses assume that the exorcism narrative came to Mark as part of this larger complex.<sup>1</sup> It seems probable,

---

<sup>1</sup>Thus Schmidt, pp. 67f., and Taylor, Mark, p. 91. Cf. also Best, pp. 112, 115, who takes 1:16-39 to be the pre-Markan complex. Knox, pp. 32-34, however, assumes that 1:21-28 came to Mark as an isolated story. Cf. also Lightfoot, History, pp. 68f.

however, that Mark has introduced v.21a and v.28,<sup>1</sup> but whether or not the reference to Jesus' teaching in vv.21b,22 and v.27 is due to his redaction is not easily determined. If the pericopae were rather loosely linked together in the pre-Markan material, it is indeed possible that Mark has at least inserted vv.21b,22.<sup>2</sup>

In any case, it is noteworthy that Mark has not presented Jesus exclusively as an exorcist whose action engenders amazement. Rather the authority of his teaching in contrast to that of the scribes is emphasized first and provides an introduction to the demonstration of his authority over the unclean spirits. Best draws attention to the significance of this feature when he declares that " . . . the word of instruction is prior to the word of exorcism and forms the basis for it."<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Thus Bultmann and Best. Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 34, while taking v.21a to be Markan thinks that v.28 was part of the original story. Schmidt, pp. 52f., on the contrary, believes that v.21a lay in the pre-Markan tradition. Cf. Marxsen, p. 37, who is concerned to show that the reference to "Galilee" in v.28 is Markan.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Bultmann, History, p. 209; Lohmeyer, Markus, pp. 34f.; Best, pp. 68f. Both Taylor, Mark, p. 171, and Cranfield, p. 71, on the other hand, contend that 1:21-28 was a pre-Markan unit.

<sup>3</sup>P. 69.



We should not suppose, however, that the actual exorcism was unimportant to Mark since Jesus' confrontations with the demons comprise a prominent part of the second Gospel. Nevertheless, to note that the second evangelist has not confined his interest to Jesus' authority over the unclean spirits provides a needed corrective to those who tend to over-emphasize the role of exorcism narratives in the total presentation of the second Gospel. J. M. Robinson,<sup>1</sup> for example, argues that the exorcisms as well as the debates which take place between Jesus and his various opponents are employed by Mark to depict on the historical plane the continuing cosmic struggle between Jesus, the Son of God, and Satan, the leader of the demonic world. According to Robinson, this contest began at the time of the Temptation of Jesus. He states,

The exorcisms are interpreted in 3:22-30 in terms of the cosmic struggle between the

---

<sup>1</sup>Pp. 33ff. See also H. Sawyerr, "The Marcan Framework," S.J.Th., 14 (1961), pp. 290-294, who also proposes that a "Satan-conflict formula"--emerging from the passages set in the wilderness, the narratives involving demoniacs and the disputes with the religious authorities--is the formative principle for the Markan Gospel. Further, J. Kallas, The Significance of the Synoptic Miracles ("S.P.C.K. Biblical Monograph"; London, 1961), esp. pp. 58-102, somewhat uncritically interprets all the miracles as signs which show that the power of Satan is being broken by Jesus.

Spirit and Satan begun in the temptation. The exorcism narratives themselves do not refer specifically to the Spirit and Satan. But they reveal the presence of the same struggle by the sharply hostile and anti-thetic form in which the stories are presented.<sup>1</sup>

In the light of this thesis, Robinson assigns great significance to the element of hostility in the scenes which take place between Jesus and the demoniacs, interpreting the words of the spirits almost exclusively as attempts to gain control over Jesus, their opponent.<sup>2</sup> Although popular ideas of magic and counter-magic undoubtedly lay behind both 1:24f. and 5:7ff. and were responsible to some extent for the actual formation of these conversations in the earliest tradition, it does not appear that Mark has unduly emphasized this feature.<sup>3</sup> Rather, it seems likely that the second

---

<sup>1</sup>p. 35.

<sup>2</sup>Cr. O. Bauernfeind, Die Worte der Dämonen im Markusevangelium (Stuttgart, 1927), pp. 3-18, who particularly stresses that the words of the demon in 1:24 are a formula of defense.

<sup>3</sup>Most recently Best, pp. 18ff., has questioned the adequacy of Robinson's position. While, on the one hand, Robinson assumes that 3:20ff. provide evidence that Mark has understood the contest between the Son of God and Satan as an on-going conflict, Best, on the other hand, concludes that the aorist subjunctive  $\delta\eta\sigma\eta\iota$  in 3:27 indicates that for the second evangelist Jesus has already decisively defeated and bound Satan in the Temptation. Best (p. 20) writes, "To us the exorcisms



evangelist was far more interested in the fact that the demons know who Jesus is.<sup>1</sup>

The unclean spirit addresses Jesus as "the Holy One of God" (v.24-- ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ ). This title was undoubtedly a part of the pre-Markan story and possibly

---

represent the plundering of the strong man's house, only possible because the strong man has been bound. We would further hold that in his actual discussion of the exorcism narratives Robinson lays too much stress on the element of struggle; we have sought alternatively to show that on each occasion Jesus is from beginning to end the master, though the demon may attempt to struggle, and he is master because he has defeated already the demon's own master, Satan." Cf. further W. H. Harter's criticism of Robinson's book: "The Historical Method of Mark," Union Seminary Quarterly Review, 20 (November, 1964), pp. 21-38 and Robinson's reply: "The Problem of History in Mark, Reconsidered," Union Seminary Quarterly Review, 20 (January, 1965), pp. 131-147.

<sup>1</sup>Burkill, pp. 74-78, rightly sees that the words of the unclean spirit in 1:24 have a Christological significance in Mark although they were probably intended originally as words of defense. Haenchen, Der Weg, p. 88, comes to the same conclusion. Burkill, pp. 78f., mentions Bauernfeind's contention that the witness of the demons would not have possessed significance for Mark or the early Church since the kingdom of Satan was hostile to the Kingdom of God and the demons were agents of falsehood. Burkill thinks, however, that Mark has intended these words to testify to Jesus' Messiahship as something which even the evil spirits are compelled to acknowledge. Van der Loos, pp. 378-382, likewise calls attention to Bauernfeind's work, accepting v.24 as the demon's words of resistance, but in doing so he fails to distinguish between the meaning which the group of words originally possessed and that which it had for the second evangelist.

goes back to an early stage of the tradition.<sup>1</sup> In the light of Mark's redaction in 3:11, it seems likely that he has understood the title in 1:24 as an equivalent to "Son of God" (cf. also 5:7).<sup>2</sup> Prior to Peter's confession in 8:29 only the demons realize who Jesus is; they recognize his divine Sonship and the consequence of his presence for them.<sup>3</sup> It would appear, therefore, that Mark was primarily interested in 1:24 because of its Christological importance.

The pericope concludes with v.28 which recounts the spreading of Jesus' fame throughout the surrounding area of Galilee. The fact that Mark has called attention to the growing popularity of Jesus does not contradict the above conclusion that only the demons know who Jesus is since in v.25 the unclean spirits are silenced by Jesus. Although the crowd expresses amazement at

---

<sup>1</sup>Hahn, pp. 235-238, concludes that the title "the Holy One of God" was used in the Palestinian stage of the tradition. Cf. e.g., Acts (3:14); 4:27; 4:30. Undoubtedly, this title was largely replaced by other Christological formulations in the later tradition.

<sup>2</sup>The title "Son of God" when used in Mark in connexion with Jesus' power to work miracles must be seen in the light of the Hellenistic θεός ἀνὴρ.

<sup>3</sup>Lightfoot, Message, p. 21, and Locality, p. 117 (thus also Nineham, pp. 75,79), interprets the words ἦλθετε ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς as a statement and not as a question.

Jesus' action, there is no suggestion that the people recognize him to be the Son of God.

Although 1:23-27 exhibits the characteristics of an exorcism story,<sup>1</sup> we have observed that Mark has not presented it merely as a wonder-tale. Rather, by focusing the attention of his reader principally on Jesus and not the demoniac (there is no reference to the demoniac in the closing verses of the pericope) the second evangelist has utilized this story to convey Christological meaning. Jesus is the Son of God whose authority is demonstrated both in his teaching and in his power over the demons,<sup>2</sup> and on account of this miracle Jesus' fame spreads (v.28). In the summary passage at the end of this section (1:39) Mark has recounted Jesus' activity in Galilee in terms of his preaching in the synagogues

---

<sup>1</sup>Bultmann, History, p. 210, lists the following features: a) the unclean spirit's recognition of Jesus, b) Jesus' rebuke of the spirit and his command for silence, c) the expulsion of the demon accompanied by convulsions and cries, and d) the astonished reaction of the crowd.

<sup>2</sup>Even if the words in v.27 κατ'ἐξουσίαν apply to διδασκῆ καὶ νῆ, thus paralleling the phrase in v.22 (thus Taylor, Cranfield, Gould and Klostermann), and not to καὶ τοῖς πνεύμασι τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις ἐκτινάσσει, the word ἐξουσία is elsewhere related to Jesus' power to exorcize since he transfers this authority to his disciples (cf. 3:15 and 6:7). Cf. Best, p. 18 and W. Foerster, ἐξουσία, T.W.N.T., vol. 2, pp. 565f.

and casting out of demons. By coupling these two actions of Jesus, Mark was possibly suggesting that the occurrence in 1:21-28 is no isolated case.<sup>1</sup>

The Healing of Simon's Mother-in-law--  
Mk. 1:29-31 (Mt. 8:14f.; Lk. 4:38f.)

This brief miracle story is linked to the preceding pericope by means of the words καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς ἐξελθόντες ἦλθον (v.29a), and, like 1:21-28, it takes place in Capernaum. The account of the healing of Simon's mother-in-law unfolds quite simply: Jesus enters the house of Simon and Andrew accompanied by both James and John; by means of the words κατέκειτο κρῆσσουσα (v.30a) the condition of the woman is noted; they (presumably the disciples) inform Jesus of her need (v.30b);<sup>2</sup> having gone to her Jesus raises her by the hand, wherewith the fever leaves her (v.31); and, recovering her health, the woman serves them (v.31b).

It is perhaps significant that this pericope includes no word of Jesus; neither is there any direct conversation between Jesus and the woman or between

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Schmidt, pp. 59f., and Taylor, Mark, p. 184.

<sup>2</sup>The phrase καὶ εὐθὺς λέγουσιν αὐτῷ περὶ αὐτῆς is better interpreted as the disciples' request for help than as their apologetic excuse for the woman's failure to appear when Jesus enters the house (Rawlinson, p. 18, suggests the latter).

Jesus and his disciples. In addition, no reference is made to the effect of this miracle on Jesus' disciples. Rather, it would appear that the story simply concerns the cure which Jesus brings about for Simon's mother-in-law and does not exhibit the more formal characteristics of a miracle story. Haenchen emphasizes this point when he declares,

Man hätte sie [this story] angesichts des geringen Wunders kaum überliefert, wenn sie nicht aus der ältesten Tradition gestammt hätte, und das kann in diesem Fall wohl nur heissen: Petrus selbst hat sie erzählt.<sup>1</sup>

Haenchen is not alone in this conclusion since most commentators assume that both 1:29-31 and 1:35-39 are related in some way to the reminiscences of Peter.<sup>2</sup> Turner,<sup>3</sup> in particular, suggests that the present account in 1:29-31 was at one time the "we" account related by the apostle, but this does not seem probable.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Der Weg, p. 89. Cf. also Lightfoot, Message, p. 22, and Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 40.

<sup>2</sup>Thus Taylor, Branscomb, Cranfield, Fuller, Gould, Johnson, Lohmeyer, Grundmann and Lagrange.

<sup>3</sup>Thus C. H. Turner, "Marcan Usage," J.T.S., 26 (1925), p. 226.

<sup>4</sup>Turner's conclusion seems to presuppose that Mark received this story directly from the apostle Peter. Haenchen, Der Weg, p. 89, doubts that the Markan account is a third person rendering of a first person version. Cf. also Nineham, p. 81.



If this story of healing was preserved in the early tradition primarily because of its association with Simon and his fellow disciples,<sup>1</sup> this explains why it does not possess as great a didactic value as certain other miracle stories. For this reason we must be aware of the danger of attaching too much significance to its details, in particular the words ἤγειρεν αὐτὴν κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς (v.31a) and καὶ διεκδύει αὐτοῦς (v.31b).

In 5:41 Jesus is also described as raising up the patient by laying hold of her hand, but in that instance he speaks a word as well. Since in 1:31 only the touch of Jesus is mentioned, it seems that Klostermann is right when he declares, "Das Aufrichten hat hier fast die Bedeutung von 'Gesundmachen'."<sup>2</sup> Jesus

---

<sup>1</sup>Schmidt, p. 56, wonders which disciples accompany Jesus in this incident since he assumes that both Simon and Andrew are mentioned only as house dwellers. Bultmann, History, p. 345; Branscomb, pp. 32f.; Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 39, all suppose that only the name of Simon originally appeared in the text, the other three names being added by a copyist who was influenced by 1:16-20. Haenchen, Der Weg, pp. 89f., assumes that Mark himself has added these names. Perhaps the singular form of the verb ἐξελεῖσθαι ἦλθεν, appearing in several MSS (B W Θ D it), is an indication that at one point in its transmission Jesus was the sole actor in this story.

<sup>2</sup>Markus, p. 18. Cf. also Strack-Billerbeck, vol. 2, pp. 2f.

assists the woman to her feet, and straightway the fever leaves, thus enabling her to serve them.

The closing words καὶ διηκόνει αὐτοῖς (v.31b) have frequently been viewed as possessing more meaning than a straightforward demonstration of the woman's cure. It is sometimes assumed that these words signify that "a change took place in the woman's soul"<sup>1</sup> but this involves unwarranted psychologizing. Richardson feels that these final words were intended as a "moral exhortation" which the early Christian teachers found useful in their work: "Christians who have been delivered from the power of sin and restored to health should at once begin to use their blessings in the service of the Lord."<sup>2</sup> Although this might be a legitimate present-day interpretation of these words, we cannot be assured that Mark saw any more in them than the confirmation of the instantaneous healing.<sup>3</sup>

It seems likely that this pericope, as 1:21-28, came to Mark in a larger block of material (1:21-39)

---

<sup>1</sup>See van der Loos, p. 555, who draws attention to this conclusion of van Leeuwen and Dehn.

<sup>2</sup>P. 76.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Taylor, Mark, p. 180; J. M. Robinson, p. 41; Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 40.

and was incorporated into his Gospel with little or no alteration.<sup>1</sup> The account simply relates the details of an event which was probably first reported orally by eyewitnesses. Although Jesus is obviously the central figure in this story, neither his name nor his specific words are explicitly mentioned. It is apparent that 1:29-31 has neither been particularly embellished nor greatly invested with theological features during the course of its transmission. Nonetheless, Jesus is here pictured as a helper of the needy, a Christological theme which the second evangelist has further emphasized in the following section, 1:32-34.

The Healing of Many People--Mk. 1:32-34  
(Mt. 8:16f.; Lk. 4:40f.)

Both the exorcism in 1:21-28 and the healing in 1:29-31 prepare the way for 1:32-34, where it is stated that the whole town brings its sick to Jesus. If, as noted above,<sup>2</sup> 1:21-39 is a pre-Markan unit, then the second evangelist was not directly responsible for the form of 1:32-34, contrary to what Bultmann apparently assumes.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Perhaps the εἰς in v.29a is to be charged to the evangelist's editorial work.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. above, p. 6.

<sup>3</sup>History, p. 341.



Unlike the usual summary, these verses contain a specific time designation (v.32a-- 'Οψίας δὲ γενομένης, ὅτε ἔδυσεν ὁ ἥλιος ) and a precise location (v.33b-- πρὸς τὴν θύραν). This latter reference to the door undoubtedly refers back to Simon's house already mentioned in v.29 while the double time reference probably serves to establish the ending of the sabbath. The people are at liberty to bring their sick to Jesus for healing without violating the sabbath.

Mark has clearly used 1:32-34 to show that Jesus' casting out of the unclean spirit and his healing of Simon's mother-in-law are not isolated instances of his activity but exist as part of a far more extensive ministry. It is interesting to note that both here and in 6:13, where the ministry delegated to the disciples is described, Mark has treated Jesus' healings and exorcisms as separate functions.

The reference to the whole city (v.33-- καὶ τὴν ὅλην τὴν πόλιν) before the house is undoubtedly an exaggeration (cf. 1:5) intended to emphasize the renown of Jesus as a healer.<sup>1</sup> Further, it is probable that Mark has not meant to suggest that Jesus heals only some (v.34--

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Klostermann, Markus, p. 19, and Taylor, Mark, p. 181.

πολλούς) of the sick brought to him (v.32--πάντας); he heals all.<sup>1</sup> Apparently both Matthew and Luke were aware of this ambiguity in Mark (cf. Mt. 8:16 and Lk. 4:40f.).

In the light of the repeating secrecy motif in Mark, it is likely that the second evangelist has inserted v.34b.<sup>2</sup> Unlike 1:24, the demons do not actually reveal his divine name,<sup>3</sup> but, nonetheless, the reader perceives that Jesus is the divine Son of God who effectively carries out his Messianic mission by healing and casting out the demons.

The Healing of the Leper--Mk. 1:40-45  
(Mt. 8:1-4; Lk. 5:12-16)

The story of the healing of the leper has no specific setting but forms the bridge between the two pre-Markan sections, 1:21-39 and 2:1-3:6.<sup>4</sup> If at one

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, pp. 179f., who notes that both Hebrew and Aramaic possess no word for "all."

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Bultmann, History, p. 341, and Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 41.

<sup>3</sup>The χριστὸν εἶναι reading in B L (C a 1) W Θ pm has presumably resulted from the assimilation of the Lukan account and should not be accepted as original.

<sup>4</sup>Knox, p. 8, suggests that 1:40-45 possibly introduced the 2:1-3:6 complex. According to him, 1:40-45 would have been an appropriate beginning for the section to illustrate that Jesus begins his

time this pericope had a precise setting, it was either lost during its transmission or was not suitable for Mark's purposes and thus was eliminated by him.<sup>1</sup>

If 1:40-45 was placed in its present context by Mark himself, what was his purpose in doing so? It is sometimes supposed that the story has been introduced at this point in the narrative in order to provide an answer to the charges of law-breaking which were levelled against Jesus.<sup>2</sup> Although the matter of Jesus'

---

ministry by observing the law and is not guilty of violating it. This suggestion, however, seems unlikely in the light of the loose connexion between 1:40-45 and its context (cf. 1:45 and 2:1). Cf. Schmidt, pp. 64f.; Taylor, Mark, p. 185; Lightfoot, Message, p. 25; Cranfield, p. 90.

<sup>1</sup>Some commentators (Schmidt, pp. 63f.; Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 45; Rawlinson, p. 22; Lagrange, Marc, p. 29) deduce from the appearance of the word ἐξέβαλεν in v.43 that the incident was originally set either in a synagogue (cf. 1:39) or in a house. This, they claim, would explain why it is reported that Jesus thrusts the man out. It is just as likely that ἐξέβαλεν is a remnant of exorcism language (thus J. M. Robinson, p. 40; cf. also Manson, Js. the Messiah, p. 44).

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Rawlinson, pp. 21f.; Lightfoot, History, pp. 108f.; Burkill, p. 126. Note again the conclusion of Knox on the previous page. Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 45, argues that 1:40-45 has resulted from the interweaving of two different versions of the same story--the one relating Jesus' order for silence which caused the fact of the healing to be widely broadcasted and the other ending with Jesus' command that the leper show himself to the priest. Even if Lohmeyer's suggestion is

observance of the law might account, at least in part, for Mark's placement of this pericope, there was perhaps also another reason.<sup>1</sup>

In Jewish thinking physical disease and abnormality were often associated with sin.<sup>2</sup> Best<sup>3</sup> points to specific instances in the Old Testament where leprosy and sin are directly related (Num. 12:10; II Ki. 5:27; II Ki. 15:5) and further notes that καθαρίζειν is sometimes used to mean the removal of sin (cf. Acts 15:9; II Cor. 7:1; Eph. 5:26; I Jn. 1:7,9 etc.).

Although the disease of leprosy undoubtedly raised the question of sin in the minds of Jesus' Jewish contemporaries and subsequently among the early Christians,

---

correct, this does not provide an answer to the query about Mark's use of the present pericope since this process would have certainly occurred in the pre-Markan tradition. (Cf. also Taylor, Mark, p. 185, who takes the opposite view and suggests that in 1:40-45 we see the beginnings of a division into two stories of what was in the earlier tradition only one.)

<sup>1</sup>Nineham, pp. 85-87, rightly sees that it was possibly for more than one reason that Mark placed this story where he did.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Strack-Billerbeck, vol. 4, pp. 747-751, and G. F. Moore, Judaism (Cambridge, Mass., 1927-30), vol. 2, pp. 248-256. Cf. further E. R. Micklem, Miracles and the New Psychology: A Study in the Healing Miracles of the New Testament (London, 1922), pp. 31-34.

<sup>3</sup>P. 107.

we must remember that 1:40-45 is not explicitly concerned with this subject. The puzzling question about the relationship between sickness and sin lies much closer to the surface in the following pericope (2:1-12). Nevertheless, it is possible that Mark has preceded the story of the healing of the paralytic with that of the cleansing of the leper because they are both linked to the same theme.<sup>1</sup> Both 1:40-45 and 2:1-12 present Jesus as the deliverer of men from wasting and disabling disorders, and it seems natural that such conditions would have reminded the early Christians of the worst of all man's sicknesses--sin.

We must now consider more carefully the details of 1:40-45. In the opening verse the leper is pictured approaching Jesus in a spirit of supplication to seek his help ( . . . παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν καὶ γονυπετῶν ). His words ὅτι ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασαι με καθαρίσαι are probably best interpreted as a request which does not question Jesus' ability to heal but rather his willingness to

---

<sup>1</sup>Best, p. 116, thinks that Mark desired to picture Jesus' healing activity as a deliverance from sin as early as possible in his Gospel. He did not insert the story of the leper any earlier, however, since he did not want to disturb the unity of 1:16-39. Cf. also Lightfoot, Message, p. 26.



do so in this particular situation.<sup>1</sup>

In response to the leper's petition, Jesus extends his hand and touches the man, declaring, θέλω, καθαρίσθαι (v.41b). Jesus' physical contact with persons is frequently mentioned (cf. 1:31; 5:41; 7:33; 8:22f.; cf. also 3:10; 5:27f.; 6:56), but this instance would seemingly possess greater significance since a leper was always considered ceremonially unclean (Lev. 15:7).<sup>2</sup> By approaching Jesus, the leper seeks restoration and this is precisely what he receives through the touch and word of Jesus.

In addition, the variant reading ὀργισθεῖς in v.41 should be noted. It seems likely that the word σπλαγχνισθεῖς was substituted for it in an early stage of the transmission of this pericope.<sup>3</sup> The reference

---

<sup>1</sup>Thus Taylor, Mark, p. 187; Cranfield, p. 91; Gould, p. 30; Grundmann, Markus, p. 50.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Taylor, Mark, pp. 187f., and Lohmeyer, Markus, pp. 46f. Richardson, p. 61, goes too far when he sees it as a "symbolic action" in which Jesus takes " . . . upon Himself the burden of defilement."

<sup>3</sup>Haenchen, Der Weg, p. 96, however, suggests that the opposite process could have taken place. According to him the one who was responsible for the special reading in D could have substituted ὀργισθεῖς for σπλαγχνισθεῖς because the reference to Jesus' "compassion" did not seem to fit with the content of v.43, where Jesus "sternly charged him [the leper], and sent him away at once." Haenchen concludes by declaring, "Es ist nur nicht so

to Jesus' anger together with the words in v.43 are perhaps remnants of an earlier interpretation of this story, and it is difficult to determine how Mark has understood them.<sup>1</sup> Even if he has interpreted v.43 in connexion with the seriousness with which Jesus demands silence,<sup>2</sup> he has made it clear in v.45 that the leper disobeys by publishing the news.<sup>3</sup>

Mark has thus employed the story of the healing of the leper as a link between the two major sections in his Gospel. Since Mark was writing from Rome, it seems logical that he and his readers would have been interested first of all in its witness to Jesus as a

---

selbstverständlich, welche Lesart jeweils wirklich die schwierigere ist.--"

<sup>1</sup>For example, J. M. Robinson, p. 40, assumes that for Mark Jesus' anger reveals the struggle against Satan since leprosy is another case of demon possession. Burkill, pp. 38f., on the other hand, thinks that Mark has understood Jesus' anger as directed against the leper since he transgresses the law by approaching.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Taylor, Mark, pp. 188f.; Cranfield, p. 94; Klostermann, Markus, p. 21; Haenchen, Der Weg, pp. 95f.

<sup>3</sup>In v.45 the healed man, not Jesus, is to be understood as the subject of ὁ . . . ἐξελθών. Branscomb, p. 39; Klostermann, Markus, p. 19; and Nineham, p. 88, assume that v.45 is a Markan addition while Schmidt, pp. 66f., and Best, p. 69, view it as the original and natural ending to the story although they allow that the words ὥστε μήκετι αὐτὸν δύνασθαι . . . ἦν might be Markan.



healer and only secondarily in its picture of him as the fulfiller of the Mosaic law. In 1:40-45 Jesus is shown as One who has the power to deliver men from disease and isolation. Although Jesus sends the healed man to the priest, he wishes to avoid public notice. In v.45 (part of which is probably redactional) it is made clear that the leper's proclamation ( ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν )<sup>1</sup> of what happened causes more people to seek Jesus even when he withdraws from the populated areas.

The Healing of the Paralytic--Mk. 2:1-12  
(Mt. 9:1-8; Lk. 5:17-26)

As well as recording the healing of the paralytic 2:1-12 testifies to Jesus' authority to forgive sins. The formation and development of this pericope in the pre-Markan tradition<sup>2</sup> need not be considered at this

---

<sup>1</sup> Assuming that 16:9ff. are not part of the original Gospel, the word κηρύσσειν appears twelve times in Mark. Undoubtedly it was to be associated with the proclamation of the gospel in the Church of Mark's day. In 1:14, 13:10 and 14:9 "gospel" is the object of this proclamation; in 1:4 and 1:7 the preaching of the Baptist is described; in 1:38f. the preaching of Jesus himself is mentioned; and in 3:14 and 6:12 the preaching of the twelve "apostles" is meant. Cf. Lightfoot, History, pp. 106f., and Best, p. 64.

<sup>2</sup> Many commentators (Bultmann, History, pp. 14f.; Taylor, Mark, pp. 191f.; Rawlinson, p. 25; Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 50) assume that vv.5b-10 were inserted into

point since this narrative undoubtedly came to Mark in a form similar to its present one within the section of conflict stories (2:1-3:6).

At least part of vv.1,2 is probably due to the editorial work of the second evangelist although it is almost impossible to determine the original beginning of the pericope. Taking εἰσελθὼν . . . εἰς Καφαρναούμ, πάλιν, δι' ἡμερῶν and ἡκούσθη to be Markan additions, Schmidt<sup>1</sup> concludes that the words καὶ ἦν εἰς οἶκον (or ἐν οἴκῳ) originally introduced the story. This suggestion, however, leaves unanswered whether or not v.2 is to be attributed to Mark. Best<sup>2</sup> thinks that most of v.2 (certainly the words καὶ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον) is Markan while Lohmeyer<sup>3</sup> asserts that v.2 must have been a part of the pre-Markan pericope since it forms the basis for the reference to the crowd in v.4.

Even if a portion of v.2 is pre-Markan, it seems likely that καὶ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον has been inserted

---

the original miracle story. (Fuller, Miracles, pp. 50f., thinks that v.5b was part of the original miracle story.) Cf. also R. T. Mead, "The Healing of the Paralytic--A Unit?," J.B.L., 80 (1961), pp. 348-354. See also Manson, Js. the Messiah, pp. 40-42, for his criticism of Bultmann's analysis of 2:1-12.

<sup>1</sup>P. 79.

<sup>2</sup>Pp. 69f.

<sup>3</sup>Markus, p. 50.

by the evangelist himself since these words occur also in 4:33 and 8:32, both of which appear to be redactional. Lohmeyer's suggestion that this phrase furnishes the necessary motive for the crowd's assembling is not convincing enough to reverse this conclusion. The more natural reason for the coming together of the crowd would be the people's eagerness to have Jesus heal their sick (cf. 1:32f.; 3:8b,9f.; 6:54-56).

Best<sup>1</sup> lists the Markan passages in which λόγος appears and rightly suggests that in certain passages it means "gospel" (cf. 4:14ff.; 4:33 and 8:32). When we couple this observation with the fact that the early Church occasionally used the phrase τὸ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ (κρυβέν) to describe the proclamation of the gospel (cf., e.g., Acts 4:29,31), it seems quite probable that Mark has intended λόγον in 2:2 in this sense.<sup>2</sup> Lohmeyer<sup>3</sup> and Best<sup>4</sup> take a further step and relate Jesus' proclamation of the word in v.2 to the principal meaning of the pericope--forgiveness.

---

<sup>1</sup>Pp. 70f.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. also Taylor, Mark, p. 193; Klostermann, Markus, p. 22; Cranfield, p. 97.

<sup>3</sup>Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 53, states, "Die Fortsetzung des 'Wortes' von V.2 ist dann V.5b; . . . "

<sup>4</sup>Pp. 70f.

Although the traditional view purporting that disease was a punishment from God for personal sin lay behind this pericope,<sup>1</sup> we are not to assume that Mark was primarily concerned with this theological issue. It would appear that he was far more interested to demonstrate Jesus' right to forgive sins on the basis of his ability to heal the paralytic. The scene vividly pictured in vv.3,4--the transportation of the paralytic to Jesus by the four men, their inability to enter the house because of the crowd, and the extreme measures taken in order to place the sick one before Jesus--sets the stage for the word of forgiveness. Jesus sees "their faith"<sup>2</sup> and declares to the paralytic, "My son (τέκνον), your sins are forgiven" (v.5b). It is possible that Mark has intended his readers to associate this evidence of faith with the subsequent word of forgiveness and healing (cf. 5:34; 10:52), but, in any case, the introduction of the word of forgiveness is obviously abrupt.

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Strack-Billerbeck, vol. 1, pp. 495f., and Grundmann, Markus, p. 59. In the light of passages like Jn. 9:2f. and Lk. 13:1-5 it would seem that other answers were also given in the early Church to this perplexing problem.

<sup>2</sup>The words τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν in v.5 probably refer both to the faith of the bearers and the paralytic.

As Lohmeyer<sup>1</sup> points out, 2:10 is the only Markan passage in which the "Son of man" title is directly linked with the forgiveness of sins. In fact, it is noteworthy that the "Son of man" is used only here and in 2:28 to describe any of Jesus' earthly activity other than his Passion.<sup>2</sup> In the light of the frequent appearance of this title in the Passion predictions, Best<sup>3</sup> suggests that its occurrence in this pericope might imply a link with the Passion; in other words, it was on the basis of Jesus' death that the forgiveness of sins was mediated to the Church through Jesus, the Son of man.

In any case, it is clear that the story of the healing of the paralytic provides for Mark, as indeed for the tradition prior to him, the setting in Jesus' earthly ministry for the demonstration of his authority to forgive sins, a reality experienced in the Church. In the narrative the scribes suppose that Jesus has

---

<sup>1</sup>Markus, p. 54. Lohmeyer understands this pericope against the background of Is. 61:1.

<sup>2</sup>Possibly the first half of 10:45 was seen as applying to Jesus' earthly ministry, but 10:45b speaks of his life as a ransom. In 8:31; 9:12; 9:31; 10:33; 14:21 and 14:41 the title is used in the Passion predictions, and in 8:38, 13:26 and 14:62 the eschatological "Son of man" figure is intended.

<sup>3</sup>Pp. 137f.



usurped the divine right which belongs exclusively to God,<sup>1</sup> but their serious charge of blasphemy is decisively silenced by means of Jesus' argument "a minori ad majus" (cf. Mt. 7:11). If Jesus can accomplish the apparently more difficult option of healing the paralytic, then certainly they must believe that he has the power to forgive sins.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, Jesus commands the paralytic to arise and go home; this he does in the presence of the amazed witnesses who glorify God and declare, "We never saw anything like this!" (v.12).<sup>3</sup> The enemies of Jesus are silent but only temporarily as the reference in 3:6 to their evil plot reveals.

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Strack-Billerbeck, vol. 1, p. 1017. In vol. 1, p. 495, it is stated that the forgiveness of sins was not a function of the promised Messiah but the exclusive right of God.

<sup>2</sup>Lagrange, Marc, p. 37, rightly points out that Jesus is not suggesting that forgiving the sins of the paralytic is less difficult than healing him but rather that the latter action is demonstrable to the eyes of men.

<sup>3</sup>v.12 is probably part of the original ending to the story of the healing of the paralytic and has not been altered to refer to the theme of forgiveness.

The Healing of the Man with the Withered Hand--Mk. 3:1-5 (Mt. 12:9-14; Lk. 6:6-11)

The healings recorded in 1:21-28 and 1:29-31 take place on the sabbath but in neither case is the controversy over the observance of the sabbath the major issue of the pericope. In the story of the healing of the man with the withered hand, however, it becomes immediately apparent that all interest is centred around Jesus' conflict with his opponents regarding what constitutes a violation of the sabbath.

Of the conflict stories contained in the pre-Markan block of material, 2:1-3:6, the last two are concerned with the sabbath controversy. In 2:23-28 the disciples of Jesus are accused of violating the sabbath because they are picking grain, but in 3:1-5 the accusation is directed against Jesus himself. These two stories were undoubtedly linked in the earliest tradition; the healing of the man's withered hand provides another specific illustration of the truth of the claim in 2:28 that " . . . the Son of man is lord even of the sabbath."<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Schmidt, pp. 103f., and Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 66. Grundmann, Markus, p. 71, as well as noting Schlatter's conclusion that 2:23-28 is intended to illustrate the meaning of the sabbath in relation to rebellion against God and 3:1-5 in relation to one's responsibility toward his neighbour, suggests that both stories are bound together as proofs of the truth of the saying in 2:28.



Since in this instance the report of the healing is used to demonstrate the truth of Jesus' teaching about the sabbath, 3:1-5 cannot be viewed as a typical miracle story.<sup>1</sup> Lightfoot rightly states,

Even if the paradigm includes the account of an act of power, such as the healing of the man with the withered hand (3:1-5), the action is subordinate, and serves only to illustrate or to heighten the impression of the saying; and no interest is shown in the manner of the miracle. Thus, in the story referred to, the essential point is to be found in the saying of Jesus, "Is it lawful on the sabbath day to do good, rather than to do harm? to make whole a life, rather than to destroy it?" And the subsequent healing only puts the precept just stated into practice.<sup>2</sup>

It would appear that the second evangelist has done little to alter 3:1-5 but has included it in his Gospel as it came to him.<sup>3</sup> Most commentators do assume that *καὶ* in v.1 is a Markan insertion intended to refer back to 1:21.<sup>4</sup> They are divided, however, in their

---

<sup>1</sup>Bultmann, History, p. 12, classifies 3:1-6 as an "apophthegm," and M. Dibelius, pp. 40, 43, lists it as a "paradigm." Cf. also Richardson, pp. 76f.

<sup>2</sup>History, p. 46.

<sup>3</sup>Thus Bultmann, History, p. 12, and Taylor, Mark, p. 220.

<sup>4</sup>Thus Taylor, Mark, p. 221; Cranfield, p. 119; Schmidt, p. 99; Bultmann, History, p. 12; Lightfoot, History, p. 37. Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 67, interprets *εἰσῆλθεν . . . εἰς συναγωγὴν* to mean that it was Jesus' customary practice to enter the synagogue and states,

opinions regarding whether or not Mark was the one who has added v.6 to this story. If, as Bultmann<sup>1</sup> suggests, Mark has appended v.6 out of a biographical interest, then it is clear that he has intentionally anticipated the drama of the Passion. It would seem, however, that Schmidt<sup>2</sup> is on more certain ground when he contends that the pre-Markan group of conflict stories in 2:1-3:5 would have seemingly required a conclusion like that in 3:6 to show the result of the growing hostility. In addition, he argues that the reference to the joint counsel of the Pharisees and the Herodians is unusual and would not have been noted if it had not been part of the original story.

It is obvious that v.6 serves not only as the climax to 3:1-5 but also the whole of 2:1-3:5. Since no direct mention of the plans for Jesus' death is made again until 11:18, this foreshadowing of the Passion in v.6 seems to be premature. If v.6 came to Mark

---

"Darum braucht καὶ ν nicht erst von Mk. eingefügt zu sein." Thus also Nineham, p. 110.

<sup>1</sup>History, p. 12. Cf. also Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 67, and Best, p. 38.

<sup>2</sup>p. 100. So also Taylor, Mark, p. 220; Cranfield, pp. 118f.; Knox, p. 10.

as the conclusion to 2:1-3:5, however, it is understandable that out of a respect for the tradition the second evangelist would have reproduced it in his Gospel.<sup>1</sup>

The opponents of Jesus play a major role in the action of this story. Although they are not specifically named until v.6, they are described in v.2 as lying in wait for Jesus in order to accuse him of violating the sabbath. This description of Jesus' enemies at the outset of the pericope replaces what normally introduces a miracle story--the portrayal of the patient being brought to Jesus. In 3:1-5 no request is made for the man with the withered hand; rather Jesus summons him and tells him to come into the middle of the synagogue (v.3).<sup>2</sup> This departure from the typical pattern of a story of healing lends

---

<sup>1</sup>Best, p. 117, observes that internally 2:1-3:6 " . . . contains the story of the Gospel in miniature, ending with the Passion (3:6)." If, as Knox (pp. 12f.) suggests, 2:1-3:6 was originally formed as an introduction to some kind of Passion narrative, then v.6 indeed would have formed a fitting ending to the conflict stories. Knox elsewhere (p. 89) postulates that the conflict story in 12:13-17 was originally linked to 2:1-3:6 in the pre-Markan source since reference is made to the Herodians only in 3:6 and 12:13. Cf. also Burkill, p. 123.

<sup>2</sup>Best, pp. 188f., notes that this is the only instance in a Markan story reporting a healing where Jesus takes the initiative.

support to the conclusion that the miracle has been used to demonstrate another theme.

Of primary importance in the story is the conflict between Jesus and his opponents over the proper observance of the sabbath. Having called the man with the withered hand into his presence, Jesus does not then immediately heal him. Instead he proceeds to direct a question against his enemies, "Is it lawful on the sabbath to do good or to do harm, to save life or to kill?" (v.4a). The Pharisees venture no answer to this question, and then Jesus takes the offensive and heals the man. It should be observed that the healing itself is briefly reported (v.5b-- καὶ ἐγένετο, καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη <sup>1</sup> ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ) and seems to come as a direct result of Jesus' angry displeasure at his enemies' hardness of heart.

The pericope which begins with the opponents' implied accusation of Jesus for his disregard of the

---

<sup>1</sup>Grundmann, Markus, p. 73, suggests that Mark's use of the word ἀπεκατεστάθη is to be associated with the expected restoration of all things (cf. Acts 1:6, 3:21; Mt. 17:11; Mk. 9:12). Whether or not Mark has consciously used this word in this way is impossible to determine. Cf. 7:37, where the "new creation" motif seems to be involved.

sabbath regulations<sup>1</sup> proceeds to his anger towards them for their hardness of heart. In addition, it seems likely that the second evangelist has interpreted Jesus' words in v.4 in the light of v.6. In other words, by his action of healing Jesus is strengthening life, that is, "saving"<sup>2</sup> it while his adversaries are planning the very opposite. They purpose to "destroy" life, namely, that of Jesus.<sup>3</sup> Although the death note is sounded here, 3:7ff. recounts Jesus' withdrawal to the sea with his disciples where he is once again surrounded by the friendly crowd.<sup>4</sup>

We have thus seen that 3:1-5 is best described as a pronouncement story in which the healing itself is placed in the service of a more prominent theme. In this case, this theme involves the debate over the

---

<sup>1</sup>The rabbis forbade assistance to a person on the sabbath unless his life was in danger. Cf. E. Schürer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, trans. J. MacPherson (Edinburgh, 1885-90), div. 2, vol. 2, pp. 103-105.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. below, p. 54.

<sup>3</sup>Thus Taylor, Mark, p. 222; Grundmann, Markus, p. 73; Rawlinson, p. 36. Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 69, states, "'Leben retten' zielt wieder auf die heilende Tat Jesu, 'töten' aber auf die geheime Absicht der Feinde, die am Schluss offen ausgesprochen wird." Haenchen, Der Weg, p. 124, notes that this same motif appears also in Jn. 11.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Lightfoot, History, pp. 110f.



correct observance of the sabbath. By word and deed Jesus demonstrates the meaning of the claim that the "sabbath was made for man, not man for the sabbath; . . ." (2:27) and brings his opponents to silence. Their silence is broken, however, in v.6, which contains the first allusion to the Passion of Jesus.

The Stilling of the Storm--Mk. 4:35-41  
(Mt. 8:23-27; Lk. 8:22-25)

The story of the stilling of the storm is the first of four miracles reported in 4:35-5:43, a section which follows the parables in 4:1-34 and precedes the account of Jesus' rejection by the people of Nazareth (6:1-6a). The reference in 6:2 to the mighty works (αἱ δυνάμεις) wrought by the hands of Jesus undoubtedly points back to these miracles.<sup>1</sup> Apparently with little alteration<sup>2</sup> Mark has employed the first of

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Held, pp. 200f., and Best, p. 75.

<sup>2</sup>Although Bultmann, History, p. 215, declares that Mark's redaction in vv.35f. ". . . can no longer be accurately separated out", he does assume ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ to be Markan. Klostermann, Markus, p. 46, likewise thinks that these words are Markan, but Schmidt, p. 135, contends that both temporal references were in the tradition. Further, Grundmann, Markus, p. 103, assumes that redactional work is in v.36 while Best, p. 74, apparently regards only the καὶ at the beginning of v.35 to be Markan. From all this we must conclude that Mark has not significantly changed this pericope.

this series as a testimony both to Jesus' power and his person as the closing question reveals, "Who then is this, that even wind and sea obey him?"

Fuller rightly supposes, "The question is deliberately left unanswered, and points to the Old Testament passages which speak of Yahweh's power to still the raging of the sea."<sup>1</sup> Although there exist only superficial agreements between 4:35-41 and the Old Testament story of Jonah,<sup>2</sup> it does seem certain that Jesus' authority over the wind and waters would have been connected with the Old Testament assertion that God alone possesses such power. Various Old Testament passages are listed by commentators,<sup>3</sup> but of them all only Ps. 107:23-32, Ps. 89:9 and Ps. 65:7 seem to be directly relevant:<sup>4</sup>

Then they [those who were at sea] cried  
to the Lord in their trouble, and he delivered

---

<sup>1</sup>Miracles, p. 53.

<sup>2</sup>In the Jonah story (Jon. 1:3-16) it is God who creates the tempestuous storm because of the prophet's disobedience, and the sea only ceases its raging once Jonah is thrown overboard. For this reason, Jesus cannot be properly likened to Jonah even though the two stories have certain aspects in common--both Jesus and Jonah are aboard a boat in the midst of a storm and both are aroused from sleep by the others on board.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Richardson, pp. 90f.; Hoskyns and Davey, pp. 69f.; Grundmann, Markus, p. 103; Nineham, pp. 146f. Cf. also van der Loos, pp. 644-646.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. also Ps. 29:3; Ps. 93:3f.; Ps. 18:16f.



them from their distress; he made the storm be still, and the waves of the sea were hushed. (Ps. 107:28f.)

Thou dost rule the raging of the sea; when its waves rise, thou stillest them. (Ps. 89:9)

(O God . . .) who dost still the roaring of the seas, the roaring of their waves, the tumult of the peoples. (Ps. 65:7)

Achtemeier<sup>1</sup> calls attention to the Old Testament understanding of the sea as the remnant of chaos--that which often represents the demonic in creation with which men must contend. Concerning 4:35-41 he stresses the following points: (a) Jesus is here depicted as stilling the chaotic waters, something which in the Old Testament only God can do; (b) in the Old Testament the sea represents the powers of chaos; and (c) Jesus' stilling the storm demonstrates that the demonic is defeated.<sup>2</sup>

To conclude at this point would not exhaust the

---

<sup>1</sup>Thus "Person and Deed, Jesus and the Storm-tossed Sea," Interpretation, 16 (April, 1962), pp. 169-176.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 174-176. Hoskyns and Davey, pp. 69-71, have already emphasized this last point by noting the use of the words ἐκετίμησεν and σίωπα, κεφίμωσο in v.39. ἐκετίμᾱν is elsewhere used to describe Jesus' rebuke of the demons residing in men (1:25; 9:25; cf. also 3:12). Cf. E. Stauffer, ἐκετίμᾱω, T.W.N.T., vol. 2, p. 623.

meaning of this narrative for Mark since it is also concerned with the disciples' lack of understanding regarding Jesus.<sup>1</sup> When the storm arises, in desperation the disciples arouse the sleeping Jesus and cry, "Teacher,<sup>2</sup> do you not care if we perish?" (v.38b); having stilled the storm Jesus reproves the disciples for their fear and lack of faith, "Why are you afraid? Have you no faith?" (v.40).

It is obvious that in this story the disciples are not placed in a particularly favourable light. They are reported asking a somewhat indignant question,<sup>3</sup> are accused of possessing no faith (cf. 9:19) and at the end of the episode are still without real understanding (cf. 6:52; 8:17f.). In 4:35-41 the fear and astonishment of the disciples not only serve " . . . to underline the greatness of their master"<sup>4</sup> but also contribute another scene to the peculiarly Markan picture of discipleship. Unlike the demons (1:24; 3:11; 5:7), the

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 91.

<sup>2</sup>In 4:35-41 no Messianic title is given Jesus but he is addressed simply as διδάσκαλε. Cf. also 5:35; 9:17; 9:38; 10:17,20; 10:35; 12:14; 12:19; 12:32; 13:1; 14:14.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Taylor, Mark, p. 275.

<sup>4</sup>Best, p. 105.

disciples do not know who Jesus is.

We can thus conclude that the second evangelist has found 4:35-41 useful both as a witness to Jesus' power over the demonic forces in creation and as a situation in which the disciples' obvious lack of faith comes to light. Since Jesus' miraculous deed was prompted by the desperate need of his followers, it is not surprising to have both these themes in the same story. It is not to be ruled out that the early Christians would have seen in this story the Lord who exhibits the power to control the evil and tempestuous "storms" which are constantly attacking the "ship of the Church."<sup>1</sup>

The Healing of the Gerasene Demoniac--  
Mk. 5:1-20 (Mt. 8:28-34; Lk. 8:26-39)

Following the story of the stilling of the storm (4:35-41) Mark has recounted the rather strange episode involving Jesus' exorcism of the demons and the destruction of the herd of swine. It seems likely that this story was joined to 4:35-41 already in the pre-Markan

---

<sup>1</sup>Best, pp. 105f., e.g., accepts such a symbolic interpretation. Van der Loos, p. 649, on the other hand, rejects all such allegory, but it is not clear why he does so unless he implies that such an interpretation is unfaithful to the historical event.

tradition as well as to at least one of the stories in 5:21-43.<sup>1</sup> Hoskyns and Davey<sup>2</sup> discover the same sequence of events in 4:35-5:20 as that recounted in Ps. 65:7 (God stills both the roaring of the sea and the tumult of the people) and, therefore, assume that Mark would have recognized this Old Testament allusion. There is no real evidence in the stories, however, to suggest that he has.

Unlike the disciples in the previous story (4:40f.) the demons immediately recognize Jesus' divine nature and address him as "the Son of the most high" (5:7; cf. also 1:24; 3:11). As in 1:24, the unclean spirits are concerned to protect themselves from Jesus. Their words in 5:7 ( ὀρχίζω σε τὸν θεόν, μή με βασανίσῃς ) disclose their awareness that Jesus possesses the power to expel them from their present domain, but whether or not the second evangelist has seen in these words an

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Bultmann, History, p. 210; Taylor, Mark, pp. 94f.; Schmidt, pp. 150-152. Even if Mark were responsible for interweaving the two stories in 5:21-43 (cf. below, p. 50 ), it is probable that 4:35-5:20 plus one of the stories in 5:21-43 formed a pre-Markan complex.

<sup>2</sup>Pp. 70f. Cf. also Nineham, p. 152, who draws attention to the fact that the version of Ps. 65:7f. is somewhat different in the Septuagint (the Old Testament as Mark probably would have known it) and concludes that this would have fit the Gentile-setting of this episode.

indication of their fear of the punishment at the end times is uncertain. In any case, the spirits have no choice but to submit in the presence of Jesus' power; this is especially brought out by the fact that the demoniac, whose fierce behaviour has been pictorially described in vv.3-5, straightway runs to Jesus<sup>1</sup> and worships him (v.6--προσεκύνησεν).<sup>2</sup> Such a picture clearly emphasizes the authority and power of Jesus as Grundmann points out,

Keiner hat über ihn [the demoniac] Gewalt. Wieder also steht Jesus vor einer Aufgabe, an der bisher jeder versagt hat und die durch keine menschliche Gewalt zu lösen war.<sup>3</sup>

Although the threatened demons know the name of

<sup>1</sup>It should be noted that it is reported that the demoniac comes to Jesus twice--in v.2 as Jesus disembarks and in v.6 from a distance.

<sup>2</sup>προσεκύνησεν occurs only twice in Mark--here and in 15:19.

<sup>3</sup>Markus, pp. 107f. Haenchen, Der Weg, pp. 192f., emphasizes this same feature when he writes, "Damit wird Jesu Überlegenheit im hellsten Lichte sichtbar. Das um so mehr, wenn sich herausstellt, was--schon nach der Schilderung von v.4--für ein gewaltiger Dämon in diesem Menschen hauste! Wenn der bei Jesus Erscheinen sofort jeden Widerstand aufgibt und nur noch flehentlich bittet, so wird daran die überragende Kraft des Gottessohnes unverkennbar deutlich." In the light of this understanding of vv.4-7 Haenchen concludes that v.8 was an addition to the story which was inserted either by an early redactor or by Mark himself because of a misunderstanding of v.7.



Jesus and seek to protect themselves by means of an oath, they are in fact powerless to save themselves. Jesus in turn asks the demoniac's name and learns that it is "Legion." Although it is generally assumed that Jesus is here pictured in accordance with the popular belief of that day regarding the need for the exorcist to know the names of the demons he intends to expel,<sup>1</sup> Haenchen<sup>2</sup> thinks that it is for a different reason that the second evangelist has mentioned this detail. According to him, Mark is primarily interested in the name itself. "Legion" discloses the large number of evil spirits controlling the man; it is an entire regiment. This, according to Haenchen, explains both the unbelievable strength of the demoniac enabling him to burst his chains (v.4) and in the light of his submission before Jesus (v.6) why Mark has included this account in his Gospel:

Ist es so verwunderlich, dass Mk in sein Evangelium gerade diese Geschichte aufgenommen hat, die soviel deutlicher als alle anderen die Überlegenheit des Gottessohnes über seine dämonischen Feinde veranschaulicht und erweist?<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Bauernfeind, op. cit., pp. 23-26.

<sup>2</sup>Der Weg, pp. 193f.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 194. It should be remembered that in none of the other Markan exorcism narratives does

After the evil spirits repeatedly attempt to bargain with Jesus (vv.10-12), they are permitted to enter the herd of swine which rushes down the steep bank into the sea and drowns (v.13). The destruction of the swine--as well as the subsequent description of the healed demoniac in v.15--undoubtedly serves as a demonstration of the reality of the exorcism.<sup>1</sup>

The presence of the herd of swine suggests that this incident takes place outside Jewish territory<sup>2</sup> and that Jesus is here in contact with the Gentile world. The view that this episode was intended by

---

Jesus require the demons to surrender their names although they sometimes know who Jesus is (cf. 1:24; 3:11). This seems to strengthen Haenchen's interpretation.

<sup>1</sup>Haenchen, *ibid.*, pp. 194f., also concludes that vv.10-13 are intended as a demonstration of the success of the exorcism, but he goes further by asserting that the 2000 swine corresponding to 2000 demons establishes concretely that every demon has left the man. He notes that at the time of Augustus a Roman legion generally numbered somewhere from 5000 to 6000 men, but in this instance he assumes that a legion represents 2000--that is 2000 demons. It would seem that Haenchen is on somewhat shaky ground in doing this since the phrase ὡς δισχίλιοι (v.13) is apparently given merely to indicate the approximate size of the herd.

<sup>2</sup>On the basis of the geographical note in v.1, scholars have not been able to locate with confidence the setting of this story. There was uncertainty even in the first century A.D. as the readings in both Matthew and Luke prove. Cf. Haenchen, *ibid.*, pp. 109f., and Lagrange, *Marc*, pp. 132-136.



Mark to explain the beginning of the Church in the Decapolis is adopted by Lohmeyer<sup>1</sup> since subsequent to the plea of the healed demoniac to remain with Jesus the man is instructed to return home to his friends and tell them what the Lord has accomplished for him (cf. v.19). Lohmeyer assumes that the words εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου πρὸς τοὺς σοῦς refer to a wider circle of people than simply the immediate family of the demoniac.

The final verse of the pericope reports that the man " . . . went away and began to proclaim in the Decapolis how much Jesus had done for him; . . ." (v.20). In view of the association of ideas in v.19 and v.20, it appears that ὁ κύριος (v.19) refers not to God but to Jesus (v.20--ὁ Ἰησοῦς). It is also probable that use of the word κηρύσσειν would cause Mark's readers to link this man's proclamation with the preaching of the gospel as they had known it,<sup>2</sup> but whether or not they would have seen 5:1-20 as an explanation of the beginnings of Christianity in the Decapolis is far less certain. It is quite possible that Mark as well

---

<sup>1</sup>Markus, pp. 98f.

<sup>2</sup>It is to be remembered, however, that the demoniac proclaims the miracle--in this narrow sense, the gospel--as the final three words of this pericope confirm, καὶ πάντες ἐθαύμαζον.

as his Roman readers would have been substantially ignorant of Palestinian geography.

Lightfoot<sup>1</sup> quite cautiously puts forth a slightly different interpretation of 5:18-20 but one which, like Lohmeyer's, concerns the development of the Church among the Gentiles. He suggests that vv.18-20 are intended to demonstrate that the Gentiles (in this case, the healed demoniac) confronted by Jesus (the "gospel") are not required to attach themselves to the Jewish Christian Church but are to remain among their own people. It needs to be remembered that Lightfoot proposed this explanation "with great reserve and a keen sense of the dangers inherent in this form of exposition . . ."<sup>2</sup> [In the original "with" begins the sentence.] and at least in part as an alternative explanation to that of Wrede, who assumed that the demoniac is aware of Jesus' divine nature and disobeys the command to go home which was intended to insure secrecy.<sup>3</sup> Nonetheless, Lightfoot's interpretation raises

---

<sup>1</sup>History, pp. 89f.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 89.

<sup>3</sup>For a criticism of Wrede's view on vv.18-20, see Burkill, pp. 91f. On p. 94 he concludes that vv.18-20 " . . . have no direct bearing on the evangelist's doctrine of the messianic secret." What, if any, of vv.17-20 is due to Mark's redaction is a moot question.

a certain question which is not easily answered. Would Mark and his readers have seen this story in the light of the Jewish-Gentile issue in the Church? According to Lightfoot, this story answers "no" to the question, "Should the Gentile Christians join themselves to the Jewish Christian Church?", but it appears that in arriving at this interpretation he attaches a specific representative meaning to the concluding verses (vv. 18-20) and at the same time neglects the content of vv. 14-17.<sup>1</sup>

It seems better to see the positive response of the healed demoniac in contrast to the negative reaction of the townspeople who request Jesus to leave their territory when they discover what has happened (vv. 16f.).<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. further Burkill, pp. 93f., for his criticism of Bauernfeind's interpretation of vv. 19f. Bauernfeind concludes that by causing the swine to stampede the demons actually outwit their exorcist since Jesus is compelled by the people to leave the district.

<sup>2</sup>Schmidt, p. 141, thinks that Mark is primarily interested in this story because it relates the people's rejection of Jesus. According to him, a similar theme dominates the whole of 3:7-6:13. Cf. also H. Sahlin, "Die Perikope vom gerasenischen Besessenen und der Plan des Markusevangeliums," Studia Theologica, 18 (1964), pp. 159-172, who suggests that in the plan of Mark's Gospel the effect of the demoniac's proclamation among the unfriendly Gentiles is first observable in 7:24-30, where Jesus next encounters a Gentile. According to Sahlin, this time the Gentile comes into Jewish territory to receive help from the Messiah. Sahlin concludes

This does not imply that Lightfoot's suggestion is outside the realm of possibility, but it does make us wonder whether in order to be consistent he would also be required to assign a broader meaning to the reaction of the other Gentiles. It seems simpler and safer to conclude that the second evangelist has here wanted to illustrate the varying reactions to a demonstration of Jesus' power--that of fear and reserve and that of gratitude and devotion. In the light of this miracle Jesus is rejected by the majority of the people in this non-Jewish area, but, nevertheless, Jesus leaves behind the man most directly affected by his act of power to provide a witness to this event.<sup>1</sup>

---

that in 7:31-37, unlike 5:1-20, Jesus is warmly received among the Gentiles and that in 8:1-10 it is confirmed that God's meal is not merely for the Jews (6:30-44) but for the entire world. Sahlin's thesis is not wholly convincing since it is neither clear that the Syrophoenician woman encounters Jesus on Jewish soil nor that 7:31-37 is deliberately presented by Mark as an instance of Gentile hospitality. In general, it seems that Sahlin has not actually taken into account the whole of Mark's theological plan.

<sup>1</sup>Burkill, p. 95, concludes that vv.18-20 are not the result of Mark's redaction but part of the original narrative. Concerning these verses, he states, "They continue to expound the theme introduced at verse 15 (the impression produced by the miracle upon the people), and they indicate that Jesus is not to be regarded merely as a strange and terrifying wonder worker. The story would circulate in the primitive communities as an account of the way in which Jesus won fame in a foreign

Jairus' Daughter and the Woman with  
the Issue of Blood--Mk. 5:21-43  
(Mt. 9:18-26; Lk. 8:40-56)

The story of the raising of the daughter of the synagogue leader<sup>1</sup> (5:21-24, 35-43) is interrupted by the episode involving the woman with the flow of blood. Whether the interweaving of these two stories is Markan, pre-Markan, or actually due to the recollection of the historical event is not easily determined.<sup>2</sup> The fact that there are differences between the language of vv. 25-34 and vv. 21-24, 35-43<sup>3</sup> supports the first two possibilities, and the similar combinations in 3:19b-35; 6:7-30; 11:12-25; (14:1-11); and 14:54-72 at least suggest that it was a favourite editorial technique of Mark. In any

---

land, and it is not impossible that the action of the healed man at the end would be seen as a sort of anticipation of the work of the apostolic missionaries." Cf. Haenchen, Der Weg, p. 195.

<sup>1</sup>The name "Jairus" is omitted in the Western MSS.

<sup>2</sup>Commentators are divided over this question: a) Rawlinson, p. 67; Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 101; Johnson, Mark, pp. 104f.; Nineham, pp. 156f.; and Best, pp. 83, 90, assume that the evangelist himself has inserted the one story within the other; b) Bultmann, History, p. 214; Grundmann, Markus, p. 113; and Fuller, Miracles, p. 55, suggest that this interweaving occurred in the pre-Markan tradition; and c) Schmidt, pp. 147f.; Taylor, Mark, p. 289; Cranfield, p. 182; and van der Loos, p. 509, suppose that a historical connexion lay behind these two incidents.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Lohmeyer, Markus, pp. 100f.; Best, p. 118; Johnson, Mark, pp. 104f.



case, we must discover what significance each of these stories possessed for the second evangelist and whether their being interlinked contributes to this meaning.

We turn first to the story of the healing of the woman. This story (vv.25-34) does not conclude with the reaction of the crowd to the miracle as is frequently the case in a miracle story; rather it ends with words of Jesus which draw attention to the woman's faith, "Daughter, your faith has made you well; go in peace, and be healed of your disease" (v.34). As in the story of Bartimaeus (cf. 10:52), the healing is thus closely associated with the faith of the person.

In this instance, however, it should be noted that the cure is mentioned twice--in vv.28f., where it is reported that the woman touches Jesus' garment and instantaneously experiences healing, and in v.34, where Jesus declares καὶ ἴσθι ὑγιὴς ἀπὸ τῆς μώστιγός σου. In this latter verse, Jesus' announcement of the healing is linked to his commendation of the woman's faith, by means of which Mark has obviously sought to explain both the woman's action and the healing. Why has the



second evangelist done this?<sup>1</sup> Was he concerned to elevate the woman's apparently superstitious attitude--that by contacting Jesus' garments she might be healed (v.28)--into the realm of faith?

In the first century A.D. it was commonly believed that miracle workers possessed power which could even be transmitted through material objects. For example, in Acts 19:12 it is reported that the handkerchiefs of Paul were effective in healing the sick (cf. Acts 5:15). Likewise Mark has elsewhere pictured the sick seeking physical contact with Jesus and his clothing in the belief that they would be healed (3:10 and 6:56). For this reason, it seems unlikely that Mark would have viewed the woman's behaviour as being superstitious, and to make such an assertion would be to assign to the second evangelist our present-day standards of judgement.

According to Haenchen,<sup>2</sup> the fact that the woman does not openly seek healing from Jesus is not to be

---

<sup>1</sup>It is, of course, possible that v.34 was a later addition--perhaps by Mark himself--since the story could have ended with the woman's confession of what had occurred. Somehow it seems more appropriate, however, that Jesus responds to her confession.

<sup>2</sup>Der Weg, p. 206.

explained by her ceremonial uncleanness (cf. Lev. 15:12ff.) but by her fear of a holy man like Jesus. Therefore, she approaches Jesus from behind in the crowd merely to touch his garment and be healed of her disease. This contact does heal her, and Jesus is aware that power has gone out from him (v.30-- δύναντιν)<sup>1</sup> and seeks to discover from the crowd<sup>2</sup> who has touched him. The disciples, who really play no prominent role in this story, respond to Jesus' question, and this sets the stage for the encounter between Jesus and the woman.

It is thus in v.33 that the fact of the healing is made public; the woman in great fear (φοβηθεῖσα καὶ τρέμουσα) comes before Jesus and confesses the truth. By means of the words in v.34 it is shown that the healing which occurred without Jesus' expressed will and word is acknowledged by him. The woman's action is described as faith, and the whole episode becomes a personal

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. W. Grundmann, δύναντις, T.W.N.T., vol. 2, pp. 286-318. 5:30 is the only passage in Mark where δύναντις is used to describe a force residing in Jesus' person (Lk. 6:19; see also Mk. 6:14).

<sup>2</sup>It should be noted that the crowd whose presence is essential to the story of the woman and not that of Jairus is first introduced in v.24b. The word συνθλίβειν which occurs in v.31 appears here also.

encounter between Jesus and the woman.<sup>1</sup>

The readers of Mark's Gospel would have probably seen a deeper meaning in the use of the phrase ἡ πύσις σου σέσωξέν σε, ἔπαυε εἰς εἰρήνην since both σῶζειν<sup>2</sup> and εἰρήνη<sup>3</sup> were important words in the Church's vocabulary. Although it seems doubtful that the second evangelist has attached any particular significance to the phrase ἀπὸ τῆς μάστιγός σου (v.34b),<sup>4</sup> it is certain that the early Church viewed salvation as involving both the spiritual and physical realms. In any event, in this story πύσις and σῶζειν are linked and form its climax. This woman, whose condition appeared to be hopeless

---

<sup>1</sup>Grundmann, Markus, p. 115, declares, "Aus dem anonymen Kraftentzug ist eine personhafte Begegnung geworden."

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Best, pp. 109f.

<sup>3</sup>The phrase ἔπαυε εἰς εἰρήνην was possibly used when Christians took leave of one another (Jas. 2:16; cf. also Acts 16:36; Lk. 7:50, 8:48). It had its roots in the Old Testament  $\text{D}\bar{\text{I}}\text{S}\text{C}\bar{\text{I}}\text{S}\text{S}\text{I}\text{S}$  (I Sam. 1:17; cf. also I Sam. 29:7; II Sam. 15:9).

<sup>4</sup>In I Clement 22:8 μάστιξ designates the torment given to a sinner. Cf. also Ps. 31:10. Cf. C. Schneider, μάστιξ, T.W.N.T., vol. 4, pp. 524f. In the New Testament it is used as a general term for disease (cf. 3:10; 5:29,34; Lk. 7:21) but it could possibly be related to the idea of sickness, signifying a scourge for sin. See also Acts 22:24 and Heb. 11:36.

(vv.25f.),<sup>1</sup> dares to make contact with Jesus' power, and, as a result, she is not only restored to health but also commended for her faith.

There is little in vv.22f.,35-43 to suggest that Mark was primarily concerned to highlight the faith of Jairus. Although both the man's posture before Jesus and his plea that Jesus should come and lay his hands upon his daughter<sup>2</sup> in order that she might be saved (vv.22f.) are expressions of faith, this theme is not mentioned again until vv.35f., where after learning of the girl's death Jesus declares to the ruler, "Do not fear, only believe" ( μὴ φοβοῦ, μόνον πίστευε). In this instance, however, it is not Jairus' faith which is being described but rather the encouraging word of Jesus, whose presence demands faith and not fear (cf. 6:50).<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The duration of her illness and the unsuccessful attempts of the physicians to cure her emphasize the hopelessness of the case (cf. 9:21; Lk. 13:11; Jn. 9:1; Acts 3:2, 4:22, 9:33, 14:8). The fact that Jesus' power heals this woman indicates his superiority over the doctors. Cf. Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 101.

<sup>2</sup>The laying on of hands was both a characteristic act of Jesus in his healings (cf. 1:41; 6:5; 8:22,23,25) and a continued practice in the early Church (cf. Acts 6:6; 8:17,19; 9:12,17; 13:3; 19:6; 28:8).

<sup>3</sup>Johnson, Mark, p. 108, notes that elsewhere μὴ φοβοῦ is used in connexion with a divine revelation (cf. Mt. 1:20; Lk. 1:13,30; Lk. 2:10). Cf. also Lohmeyer, Markus, pp. 105f. It seems doubtful, however, that in v.36 these words are invested with such meaning.

Unlike the preceding account which ends with a reference to the woman's faith, this story concludes with the witnesses' reaction to the miracle and Jesus' command that the girl be given something to eat, both of which establish the fact of the miracle.

As we have observed, it is the woman who to a great extent dominates the first incident. In this second episode, however, it is Jesus, not Jairus, who is the main actor. Jesus responds to Jairus' appeal (vv.23f.) and is not thwarted by the messengers' announcement of the girl's death (v.35); upon his arrival at the house he expels the mourning party (vv.38-40a) and permits only a selected few to be witnesses of the miracle; and finally he speaks and acts with authority as the resuscitation of the girl is reported (vv.41-43).

Certain of the details of vv.35-43, most of which were probably part of the narrative prior to Mark and were retained by him as essential to the story, are undoubtedly intended to contribute to the drama of the story and prepare for its climax, the raising of Jairus' daughter. The message from the men that the girl is dead and that there is no further need to bother Jesus



emphasizes the absolute hopelessness of the situation,<sup>1</sup> and over against this stands Jesus' call to faith. The laughter of the mourners in response to Jesus' declaration, "The child is not dead but sleeping" (v.39b), draws further attention to the apparent futility of the scene and provides another indication of the magnitude of the miracle which Jesus is about to effect.<sup>2</sup> The raising of Jairus' daughter is a miracle which only the selected few are allowed to witness--the three leading disciples (v.37) and the girl's parents (v.40). This selection stresses the secrecy which is intended to surround this miracle; the need for secrecy is further emphasized by Mark by means of Jesus' command for silence (v.43).<sup>3</sup> Although in both 1:45 and 7:36 Jesus'

---

<sup>1</sup>Haenchen, Der Weg, p. 208, thinks that this feature of the story--the arrival of the messengers--is quite unrealistic and was probably inserted by Mark for the benefit of his readers. If Mark himself was the first to join these two stories, then Haenchen's suggestion is not unreasonable.

<sup>2</sup>Cr. Bultmann, History, p. 221.

<sup>3</sup>This command for silence is probably Markan since it seems to fit the details of the story rather poorly. For example, in v.35 the girl's death has already been publicly announced and in v.38 the presence of the mourners further substantiates the fact of her death. How then can the miracle be kept secret? It would appear that Mark has introduced the command for secrecy because this miracle possesses Christological significance and points to the identity of Jesus. Branscomb, p. 96;



command is disobeyed, this is not the case here. Mark has made no reference to the spreading of the news of this miracle.

Although Jesus' word in v.39 is somewhat puzzling and has frequently been given a rationalizing interpretation by commentators, there is no reason to suggest that the second evangelist thought that the girl was not actually dead. Undoubtedly, Mark has intended this story as a demonstration of Jesus' power over death. Haenchen explains the statement of Jesus in v.39 in the following way:

Natürlich hat Mk nicht wie die rationalistischen Erklärer an einen Scheintod gedacht; Jesu Wort fällt ja, bevor er das Mädchen gesehen hat! Mk glaubt an eine regelrechte Totenerweckung. Aber das Wunder liegt für ihn schon darin, dass Jesus dieses Wort spricht, noch bevor er die Tote gesehen hat; kraft seines die Grenzen des Menschlichen überspringenden Wissens sagt er: "Sie ist nicht tot, sondern schläft nur!" Aber wir verstehen, dass man sehr bald dem so naheliegenden, Jesu Macht noch mehr steigernden Irrtum verfiel und von einer wirklichen Totenerweckung zu lesen meinte.<sup>1</sup>

For Mark this story recounts Jesus' raising the girl

---

Klostermann, Markus, pp. 53f.; Lightfoot, History, p. 72; Best, p. 40; and Haenchen, Der Weg, p. 211, judge the command for silence to be Markan. Cf. also Taylor, Mark, p. 297, and Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 108. V.43b was probably the original ending to the miracle story.

<sup>1</sup>Der Weg, p. 209. Cf. Fuller, Miracles, pp. 56f.

from the dead by means of his touch and his words, "Little girl, I say to you, arise" (ἐγείρε).<sup>1</sup> Both he and his readers would have undoubtedly seen this story in the light of Jesus' own Resurrection from the dead (cf. I Cor. 15:12ff.; I Thess. 4:13ff.). Jesus has the power not only to heal but even to raise the dead--this could be none other than the power of God.

We have thus seen that Mark has effectively recounted both stories in vv.21-43. Although no one theme runs throughout both incidents,<sup>2</sup> the interjection of the story of the woman has heightened the drama of the second story. In the story of the healing of the woman the theme of Jesus' power is linked with that of faith; while the subject of faith is not entirely absent in the second story (vv.22,36) the principal focus is on Jesus' power to bring to life the dead. In these stories Jesus is manifestly shown as the divine Son of God who exercises power over disease and death.

---

<sup>1</sup>It should be noted that Mark has translated for his readers the words, ταλιθα κουμ (v.41).

<sup>2</sup>Grundmann, Markus, p. 116, suggests that the fact of ceremonial uncleanness concerns both stories since Jairus (v.35) had to decide whether or not he would permit Jesus, who was ceremonially unclean because of his contact with the woman, to enter his house. Such a theme, however, is not made explicit in the course of the narrative and is a psychological reconstruction of the event.

The Feeding of the Five Thousand--  
Mk. 6:30-44 (Mt. 14:13-21; Lk. 9:10-17)

The fact that each of the four evangelists has included at least one feeding narrative in his Gospel demonstrates the significant place this miracle story enjoyed in the early tradition. Although it can never be decided with absolute certainty whether the two accounts in the second Gospel (6:34-44; 8:1-10) harken back to one or two events, they are presumably doublets<sup>1</sup> and undoubtedly came to Mark in the tradition. Since the two accounts are by no means identical, we now turn to the Markan version of the feeding of the 5000 in order to determine the meaning it possessed for the second evangelist.

Above all else, Mark would have understood the feeding of the 5000 as a miraculous demonstration of Jesus' power to provide for the needs of men. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the Markan account does not mention

---

<sup>1</sup>Bultmann, History, p. 217; Schmidt, p. 192; Branscomb, pp. 112f.; A. Menzies, The Earliest Gospel (London, 1901), pp. 160f.; Klostermann, Markus, p. 62; Schniewind, Markus, p. 97; van der Loos, pp. 619f.; and Fuller, Miracles, p. 57, think that the two accounts are doublets. Cf., on the other hand, J. Knackstedt, "Die beiden Brötvermehrungen im Evangelium," N.T.S., 10 (1963-64), pp. 309ff., who argues that two historical events lie behind these accounts.

any astonished reaction of the crowd or the disciples as is the case in Jn. 6:14f. The references to the large amount of left-over food and the size of the multitude (vv.43f.) are undoubtedly intended to stress the magnitude of the miracle performed by Jesus, but it is nowhere suggested that the crowd either acknowledges the greatness of this deed or recognizes who Jesus is. Later in his Gospel (cf. esp. 6:52 and 8:14-21), the second evangelist has specifically related the disciples' failure to understand Jesus with their participation in the feeding miracles. We will consider this Markan theme more carefully once we have commented on 8:1-10.

In v.30 it is reported that the apostles return from their mission of preaching and healing (6:7-13) and relate to Jesus all that they did and taught. Mark has intentionally sandwiched the episode involving King Herod and the beheading of John the Baptist (6:14-29)<sup>1</sup> between these two occurrences, a technique by which he has been able to stress the effect of their work. Even King Herod hears of this activity which was done in Jesus' name (6:14-- . . . φανερόν γάρ ἐγένετο τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ) and believes

---

<sup>1</sup>J. Bowman, The Gospel of Mark: The New Christian Passover Haggadah (Leiden, 1965), p. 155, goes beyond the evidence when he parallels the details of 6:14-29 with the feeding narrative.

that these things are occurring because John the Baptist is raised from the dead.

According to Mark, it is on account of the disciples that Jesus withdraws to a lonely place. They need rest and time to eat (v.31).<sup>1</sup> The people follow them, however, and when Jesus disembarks, a great crowd is waiting (vv.32-34a). At the sight of the people compassion prompts Jesus to teach them (v.34b).

Although Jesus' compassion is not generally mentioned in the miracle stories, it is referred to both here and in the second feeding miracle (8:2).<sup>2</sup> Mark has suggested that Jesus' compassion is motivated by the appearance of the crowd; they seem to be sheep without a shepherd. This picture would have undoubtedly brought to the readers' minds certain Old Testament passages (cf. Num. 27:17; II Chron. 18:16; Ezek. 34:5; see also II Kingdoms 22:17; Judith 11:19) and perhaps, in particular, would have reminded them of Moses and

---

<sup>1</sup>Grundmann, Markus, p. 132, suggests that the reference in v.31 to the "coming and going" of many people is explained in the light of the effectiveness of the disciples' mission.

<sup>2</sup>Excluding 1:41, where ὁριθεῖς is probably the original reading, the word σπλαγχνίζεσθαι appears in Mark only in the feeding narratives and in 9:22.



the feeding with manna in the wilderness (Exod. 16).<sup>1</sup> Although it seems likely that the second evangelist has given form to vv.30-34,<sup>2</sup> we cannot be certain that he was the first to introduce this Old Testament allusion into v.34b. There is little evidence elsewhere in the second Gospel suggesting that Mark has deliberately developed a "new Moses" motif.<sup>3</sup>

In this instance, however, it seems likely that both Mark and his readers would have viewed Jesus as the second Moses who teaches his people and provides them with food in the wilderness.<sup>4</sup> God's gift of food

---

<sup>1</sup>A. Heising, "Exegese und Theologie der Alt-und Neutestamentlichen Speisewunder," Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie, 86 (1964), p. 91, suggests that the picture of Jesus in 6:34 is a fulfilment of Ps. 23. It must be questioned whether Ps. 23 was as well known in the New Testament Church as in that of the present day.

<sup>2</sup>Thus Schmidt, pp. 178ff.; Taylor, Mark, p. 318; Best, p. 76.

<sup>3</sup>Bowman, op. cit., (cf. esp. pp. 156-159) is probably mistaken when he assumes that Mark has deliberately developed the Mosaic theme. Rather, it is important to see that the "Mosaic Servant-Prophet" Christology of the feeding narrative is a sign of the earlier tradition (thus Fuller, Christology, p. 171).

<sup>4</sup>U. Mauser, Christ in the Wilderness ("Studies in Biblical Theology," No. 39; London, 1963), pp. 133-138, concludes on the basis of the wilderness-motif that in 6:30-44 Mark has intended to picture "... the eschatological fulfilment of the second exodus" (p. 137). Mauser over-emphasizes this theme.



for the sustenance of men and the communication of his living word are linked here, and perhaps it is significant that Jesus first ministers to the crowd by teaching them. Only after the disciples call his attention to the lateness of the hour (vv.35f.) does the miracle of the loaves unfold.

Beyond this we must briefly consider the much discussed question of the relationship between this and the other feeding narrative in 8:1-10 to the early Church's Eucharist.<sup>1</sup> Did Mark and his readers see this feeding

---

<sup>1</sup>Taylor, Mark, pp. 321,324; Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 130; Cranfield, pp. 222f.; Nineham, p. 179; Richardson, p. 96; and J. M. Robinson, p. 83, assume that there is some relationship between the feeding narratives and the Eucharist. A. G. Herbert, "History in the Feeding of the Five Thousand," Studia Evangelica, vol. 2, ed. F. L. Cross, ("Texte und Untersuchungen," Band 87; Berlin, 1964), pp. 68-72, emphasizes the Eucharistic interpretation of Mk. 6:30-44. G. H. Boobyer, "The Eucharistic Interpretation of the Miracle of the Loaves in St. Mark's Gospel," J.T.S., n.s. 3 (1952), pp. 161-171, however, argues that Mark has intended the feeding miracles merely as witnesses to Jesus as "the Bread of Life" with no connexion existing between these accounts and the Eucharist. B. van Iersel, "Die wunderbare Speisung und das Abendmahl in der synoptischen Tradition," N.T., 7 (June, 1964), pp. 167-194, counters Boobyer's argument and convincingly demonstrates that such a connexion probably existed already in the pre-Markan tradition. Finally, Schniewind, Markus, p. 98, and Grundmann, Markus, p. 137, accept an eschatological interpretation for these feeding narratives [cf. further E. Stauffer, "Zum apokalyptischen Festmahl in Mc. 6:34ff.," Z.N.W., 46 (1955), pp. 264-266].

miracle as a prototype of the sacramental meal in which they continually participated? It seems reasonable to conclude that they did make this association in a general sort of way. It must be observed, however, that the Eucharistic interpretation of the feeding episode does not become explicit until Jn. 6. The verbal agreements between the key verses in the feeding narratives where Jesus blesses and breaks the loaves (6:41 and 8:6) and the account of the institution in 14:22 probably already lay in the pre-Markan tradition and suggest a common and perhaps somewhat formalized pattern.<sup>1</sup> At least in part these agreements are to be explained by the fact that in each instance a Jewish meal was taking place. There is no real evidence that Mark has deliberately brought the feeding narratives into agreement with the account of the institution of the Lord's Supper as van Iersel points out:

Wenn Markus selbst einen oder beide Speisungsberichte mit dem Abendmahl in Zusammenhang

---

<sup>1</sup>Van Iersel, op. cit., p. 178, notes that there is a far greater verbal agreement between 8:6b-8a and 6:41-42 (45.4%) than between the remainders of the two feeding accounts (15.9% agreement between 8:1-6a, 8b-10 and 6:35-40, 43f.). Such a comparison as this, however, can be misleading since in the former instance there is less chance of diversity in vocabulary. The activity being described in 8:6b-8a and 6:41-42 is the same and is somewhat limited in its scope.

hätte bringen wollen, so wäre zu erwarten gewesen, dass er die Kernformel dem Einsetzungsbericht seines Evangeliums angepasst hätte. Das hat er nicht getan.<sup>1</sup>

It seems wise to conclude, therefore, that although the feeding miracle was probably interpreted in the light of the Church's Eucharistic experience already in the pre-Markan tradition, we have no evidence to show that the second evangelist has sought to forward this association. In the first place, Mark has been interested to use this story to demonstrate the beneficent action of Jesus, in which his disciples actively participate, towards his shepherdless people. The disciples are initially commanded by Jesus to provide something for the crowd to eat (v.37), and after announcing what provisions are available, they participate in the feeding by distributing the bread (v.41) and collecting the remaining fragments (v.43). From this point onwards in his Gospel, Mark has demonstrated a special interest in the role of the disciples and their understanding of Jesus. They should comprehend the significance of the miracle of the loaves and fish, but they do not.<sup>2</sup> This fact is

---

<sup>1</sup>Op. cit., p. 178.

<sup>2</sup>Grundmann, Markus, p. 137, states, "Die wenige Speise, die die Jünger hatten, hat unter der segnenden Hand Jesu alle gesättigt. Nur den Jüngern ist offenbar, was hier geschehen war, denn die Menge war an der vor-

reiterated at the end of the next story where the disciples are confronted by Jesus on the sea (cf. 6:52).

Jesus' Walking on the Water--  
Mk. 6:45-52 (Mt. 14:22-33)

6:45-52 relates the second miracle of Jesus which has its setting on the Sea of Galilee (cf. 4:35-41), and it seems likely that the two episodes were closely associated in the early tradition. Even if, as Lohmeyer<sup>1</sup> suggests, this second Sea of Galilee miracle story is the result of a combination of two different accounts, such a process probably occurred before the story came to Mark.

It is immediately obvious that, like 4:35-41, this

---

bereitenden Verhandlung nicht beteiligt. Da zum erstenmal im Bericht des Markus die Jünger in die Handlung eingeschaltet sind, was nun regelmässig geschieht, wird festgehalten, dass eine Zeit besonderer Jüngerunterweisung beginnt." Cf. also Lohmeyer, Markus, pp. 128f.

<sup>1</sup>Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 131, concludes: "1. Der Grundstock der Erzählung ist die Epiphanie Jesu auf dem Wasser; vgl. V.48 Ende. Zu ihr gehört das Offenbarungswort: Ich bin es, und als Gegensatz das andere: Es ist ein Gespenst; weiter die Zeitbestimmung 'um die vierte Nachtwache', die johanneischer Art entspricht, aber nicht der des Mk; wohl auch V.47, dessen Zeitbestimmung sich mit 6:35 stösst. 2. Eingeschoben ist eine in der Situation verwandte Geschichte von Jesus als dem Helfer in Seenot; sie verwendet das Wandeln auf dem See (V.48), um den Jüngern im Sturme Rettung zu bringen. Zu ihr gehört also V.48 abc (ohne περί τετάρτην φυλακήν τῆς νυκτός) 50. (καὶ λέγει bis θαρσείτε) 51. Ihr Ziel liegt in dem Satz: und der Wind legte sich." Cf. also Bultmann, History, p. 216.



pericope presents Jesus as the Son of God who exercises power over the natural forces--in particular, the waters of the sea. The general Old Testament theme of Yahweh's control over the waters certainly lies behind this story,<sup>1</sup> but it seems somewhat unwise to take a further step and argue that here Jesus is being portrayed as the lord over death as Lohmeyer<sup>2</sup> does on the basis of the close association of the ideas of death and waters in the Old Testament. It is doubtful that the second evangelist would have had such an Old Testament equation in mind although it must be admitted that this story is concerned in an indirect way with the question of death--the disciples' lives are endangered by the perils of the stormy sea.

In the light of what we have just said, another point needs to be stressed. 6:45-52 is a story in which the power of the Son of God is dramatically demonstrated in connexion with the desperate situation of the disciples. In other words, the account of this miracle has

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. above, pp. 38f. Cf. also Job 9:8, 38:16; Ps. 77:19; Sirach 24:5.

<sup>2</sup>Markus, p. 135. Lohmeyer concludes regarding 6:34-44 and 6:45-52: "Dann würden die beiden Erzählungen Jesus als den Herrn des Lebens und Überwinder des Todes verstehen lehren--"

not survived merely to enshrine this deed of Jesus and thus verify his divinity, but this revelation of Jesus is intimately connected with the needs of his disciples.<sup>1</sup>

Following the feeding of the 5000, it is reported that Jesus compels his disciples to embark for Bethsaida while he dismisses the crowd (v.45). Unlike Jn. 6:15, Mark has not explained why Jesus sends the disciples ahead. When Jesus withdraws to the hills to pray (v.46) and the disciples are on the sea at night having difficulty with rowing on account of the wind (vv.47,48a), the scene is set for their miraculous rescue by Jesus. Jesus sees the disciples in trouble and comes to them walking on the water.<sup>2</sup> Although the words in v.48c ( καὶ ἤθελεν παρελθεῖν αὐτοῖς )<sup>3</sup> are enigmatic, the story

---

<sup>1</sup>Haenchen, Der Weg, p. 252, rightly emphasizes this point.

<sup>2</sup>Haenchen, Ibid., pp. 252f., draws attention to the inconsistency of the story's details in regard to the reference to the night. For example, if it were night (v.47a-- καὶ ὄψις γενομένης . . . ), how does Jesus see the disciples who are in the middle of the lake?

<sup>3</sup>These words have been variously interpreted. Undoubtedly, van der Loos, pp. 652f., over-simplifies the problem when he translates the words in the following manner: "for he would have passed their way." Richardson, p. 93, suggests that Mark has retained these words to indicate that Jesus tests the faith of his disciples [" . . . our prayers for His coming do not seem to be answered immediately" (cf. Lk. 24:28)]. This implies an unusual subtlety on Mark's part. Fuller, Miracles,



ends by reporting that Jesus joins his disciples in the boat, causing the wind to cease (v.51).

By means of v.52<sup>1</sup> the second evangelist has clearly indicated his special interest in the disciples and their understanding of this event. In fact, by means of the words οὐ γὰρ συνήκαν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρτοις he has even explained the disciples' behaviour on the basis of their failure to comprehend the significance of the previous miracle of Jesus, the feeding of the 5000. Whether or not these two pericopae (6:35-44 and 6:45-51) were joined in the pre-Markan tradition,<sup>2</sup> it is obvious that Mark has

---

p. 59, thinks that these words " . . . indicate the mysterious behaviour of a divine Being." Cf. Taylor, Mark, p. 329, for other explanations. Most recently Haenchen, Der Weg, pp. 254f., has suggested that these words are intended by Mark to explain why the disciples think Jesus is a ghost. According to him, Mark has used this means to counter the anticipated criticisms of the non-Christians who hear this story. If Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 135, is correct in detecting in 6:45-52 the remnants of two accounts, then the incongruity of this phrase is better explained (thus also Lightfoot, History, p. 116). How Mark has actually understood this detail of the story is quite uncertain; perhaps he has merely included it out of deference to the tradition and has been willing to leave it as being somewhat disconnected.

<sup>1</sup>It is almost unanimously agreed among commentators that v.52 is a Markan addition. Thus Taylor, Mark, p. 330; Bultmann, History, p. 216; Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 131; Best, pp. 78, 105; Grant, I.B., vol. 7, p. 745; Fuller, Miracles, p. 74.

<sup>2</sup>Since vv.45f. exhibit no clear signs of Mark's redaction, it seems likely that these two stories were

successfully created a significant connexion between the two.

Since the spiritual blindness of Jesus' disciples is nowhere mentioned in the story of the feeding of the 5000, it is doubly significant that by means of v.52 Mark has drawn both of these incidents into his theme regarding the ignorance of the disciples. Not only do the disciples fail to recognize the true nature of the one who multiplies the bread and fish, but they also mistake Jesus for a ghost (v.49). At the sight of Jesus on the water, they all cry out and give utterance to their great fright (v.50-- καὶ ἐταράχθησαν).<sup>1</sup> Even after Jesus speaks to them and joins them in the boat, thus causing the wind to cease, the anxious condition of the disciples is reiterated (v.51-- καὶ λίαν [ἐκ περισσοῦ]<sup>2</sup> ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἐξέσταντο). The initial fear of the disciples is replaced by the feeling of utter astonishment, but in view of v.52 it is obvious that this

---

linked in the pre-Markan tradition. Thus Schmidt, p. 193; Klostermann, Markus, p. 64; Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 132; Taylor, Mark, p. 326; Haenchen, Der Weg, p. 253.

<sup>1</sup>Lagrange, Marc, p. 174, comments, "Ce n'est pas le vent qui leur faisait peur, mais l'apparition d'un spectre.

<sup>2</sup>These words are omitted in the Egyptian-type MSS as well as in most of the old Syriac translations.

latter reaction does not issue from a refurbished faith. It is linked with their misunderstanding of the miracle of the loaves and caused by their hardness of heart.<sup>1</sup>

All in all, Mark has taken extreme care to emphasize that the disciples are completely blind to the significance of this miracle of Jesus. If, in addition, he has viewed the words of Jesus addressed to the disciples (v.50--*ἀποστείτε, ἔγώ εἰμι μὴ φοβεσθε*) as a revelatory declaration of the divine Son of God,<sup>2</sup> then for him the disciples' reaction of astonishment mentioned in v.51 is all the more inexcusable. Jesus has seen them in their hour of danger and after crossing the water has rescued them. As a result, the disciples do not worship him as the Son of God (thus Mt. 14:33) but remain in a stupor of ignorance.

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. 8:17; 3:5; 10:5. See also J. M. Robinson, p. 76. Bowman, *op. cit.*, p. 159, associates "the hardness of heart" directly with the Exodus story, i.e., Pharaoh.

<sup>2</sup>The *ἔγώ εἰμι* expression with its important Old Testament background (Exod. 3:14; cf. also Is. 41:4, 43:10, 52:6) appears frequently in John's Gospel (cf. e.g., Jn. 6:20; 8:24,28,58; 13:19; 18:5,6,8). Although Mark has certainly not attached the same significance to this expression as has John, it is not likely, on the other hand, that it had no meaning for him (cf. 14:62). Cf., however, Hahn, p. 182.

We have thus seen that v.52 provides the key to the Markan interpretation of this second Sea of Galilee miracle story. Although the first disciples failed to grasp the significance of Jesus' action, Mark's readers would not. Undoubtedly they would have viewed this story as a testimony to the Son of God who continually rescues his disciples in times of distress.<sup>1</sup>

The Daughter of the Syrophoenician Woman--  
Mk. 7:24-30 (Mt. 15:21-28)

Like 3:1-6, this miracle story is not preserved primarily because of its witness to the miraculous deed performed by Jesus but because of its didactic value. In v.25 it is reported that the illness of the girl is caused by an unclean spirit, and the words in v.26 ( τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐκβάλῃ . . . ) and in the concluding verses ( ἐξελήλυθεν . . . τὸ δαιμόνιον . . . καὶ τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐξεληλυθὸς ) further demonstrate that this is intended as another instance of demon possession. Unlike the accounts in 1:23-28, 5:1-20 and 9:14-29, however, this story does not describe in detail Jesus' encounter with the demons and the resulting exorcism. In this case,

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Best, p. 105. Both Rawlinson, p. 88, and Cranfield, pp. 228f., allegorize this story to such an extent that every detail--for example, Jesus' coming in the "fourth watch"--is related to the Church's situation.

the healing itself occurs some distance from the place where Jesus meets the girl's mother. This fact demonstrates that the principal theme of 7:24-30 does not concern Jesus' mastery over the unclean spirits but rather his meeting with this Gentile woman who seeks help for her daughter.

As Lohmeyer<sup>1</sup> observes, this story of healing does not exhibit the usual characteristics of a miracle story. Instead, the request of the woman is presented in indirect speech (v.26b); Jesus heals the daughter without seeing her (cf. Mt. 8:5-13); and he pronounces no healing word but indicates that the daughter has been healed because of the woman's expression of faith.<sup>2</sup> All this confirms the conclusion above that the miracle does not hold the central position in the narrative. The story reaches its climax in vv.27f. in the conversation between Jesus and the woman. Although the illness of the

---

<sup>1</sup>Markus, p. 145.

<sup>2</sup>Most commentators (Rawlinson, p. 99; Johnson, Mark, p. 138; Klostermann, Markus, p. 72; Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 148; Taylor, Mark, p. 351) assume that the words in vv.29f. imply that the girl is healed by Jesus. Taylor, in an additional comment, allows that Jesus is here being depicted as telepathically aware of what is happening to the girl, but such an explanation presupposes on the part of Mark a certain psychologizing tendency which is more characteristic of our age.



girl provides the reason for the woman's approaching Jesus, the healing itself takes place as the natural outcome of this interchange.

This pericope has probably come to Mark as a unit and by means of v.24 has been inserted by him into 6:30-7:37, which parallels the material in 8:1-26.<sup>1</sup> The second evangelist has placed 7:24-30 directly after the section which concerns Jesus' dispute with the Pharisees and scribes about ceremonial regulations. Perhaps, as it is sometimes suggested,<sup>2</sup> he has deliberately done

---

<sup>1</sup>See T. A. Burkill, "The Syrophoenician Woman: The Congruence of Mark 7:24-31," Z.N.W., 57 (1966), p. 24, who on the basis of the language in v.24 and v.31 argues that Mark, supplying these topographical details, was responsible for fitting the story of the Syrophoenician woman into its present context. On pp. 32f. Burkill puts forth an interesting suggestion. He postulates that Mark has consciously pictured Jesus operating in all the geographical locations, with the exception of Idumea, which are mentioned in his summary in 3:7-12. This, of course, includes Tyre and Sidon referred to in 7:24,31. [Cf. L. E. Keck, "Mark 3:7-12 and Mark's Christology," J.B.L., 84 (1965), pp. 345ff., whose analysis of this summary pericope supports the conclusion that Mark was here interested " . . . to show Jesus' appeal to the non-Jewish world" (p.353).] Finally, on pp. 35-37, Burkill opposes the conclusion of Marxsen (pp. 43f.) that the reference in v.24 to Tyre is pre-Markan and that the second evangelist has reluctantly included this incident in his Gospel in deference to the tradition.

<sup>2</sup>Thus Best, p. 120. Perhaps the second evangelist has also made this connexion because of the clean-unclean theme which is the subject of 7:1-23. The Gentile, considered unclean by the Jew, illustrates Jesus' teaching that it is the condition of a person's heart, not



this to indicate that in his ministry Jesus turns to the Gentiles because of the persistent opposition of the Jewish leaders. It is possibly in this way that Mark has sought to validate what proved to be the historical course of events in the early Church's mission.<sup>1</sup>

If then Mark has intentionally linked the story of the Syrophoenician woman to 7:1-23, how are we to understand the words in v.24b (καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς οἰκίαν οὐδένα ἤθελεν γινῶναι)?<sup>2</sup> Although in v.24 Jesus evidently penetrates into Gentile territory,<sup>3</sup> it seems likely that his

---

externals, which counts. Cf. Lightfoot, History, p. 114, and Burkill, Z.N.W., 57 (1966), pp. 28f.

<sup>1</sup>In Acts 13:45f. Paul and Barnabas accuse the Jews, saying, "It was necessary that the word of God should be spoken first to you. Since you thrust it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life, behold, we turn to the Gentiles" (cf. also Acts 18:6). Cf. W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism (2nd ed.; London, 1955), pp. 68f., who draws attention to Paul's practice of preaching first to the Jews in the synagogues. Paul's claim to be the apostle to the Gentiles must be seen against this background.

<sup>2</sup>Probably these words together with καὶ οὐκ ἠδυνάσθη λαθεῖν are redactional. Cf. U. Luz, "Das Geheimnismotiv und die markinische Christologie," Z.N.W., 56 (1965), p. 14. Elsewhere (9:28; 9:33; 10:10) when Jesus enters "a (the) house", he instructs his disciples. Other healings (1:29-31, 32-34; 2:1-12; 5:35-43) take place in or in front of a house.

<sup>3</sup>Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 145, states, "Der einleitende Satz 24 dient lediglich dem Zweck, einen 'heidnischen' Rahmen zu schaffen; die Geschichte des Ereignisses beginnt mit 25." This is contrary to H. Sahlin, op. cit.,

entry into the house is intended to indicate that this excursion is not a mission to the Gentiles. This explanation fits the remainder of the narrative since it is reported that Jesus immediately responds to the plea of the woman, who is described as a Gentile in v.26a,<sup>1</sup> by pointing out the priority of the Jews. In other words, Jesus not only deliberately avoids contact with the Gentiles (v.24), but also even after the woman discovers him he is hesitant to grant her request. It is true that because of the woman's great faith Jesus finally yields and heals her daughter; nevertheless, throughout the narrative a definite tension is maintained

---

p. 164, who takes the words εἰς τὰ ὅρια Τύρου (καὶ Σιδῶνος) in v.24 as a later insertion under the influence of the Matthean account in order to maintain that this story takes place not in Gentile territory but on Jewish soil. Lightfoot, History, p. 63, refers to Turner's conclusion regarding Mark's use of δέ ["A Textual Commentary on Mark 1," J.T.S., 28 (1927), p. 152]. According to Turner, Mark has normally used καὶ to introduce his paragraphs and δέ only when he has intended to indicate a division in his narrative. Regarding 7:24, Turner states, " . . . our Lord passes for the first time outside the confines of Palestine." But has Mark not pictured Jesus outside Palestine in 5:1ff.?

<sup>1</sup>Although in v.25 the suppliant is simply described as "a woman" (γυνή), she is later identified specifically by the words Ἑλληνίς, Συροφοινίκισσα τῷ γένει (v.26). C. H. Turner, "Markan Usage," J.T.S., 26 (1925), p. 150, thinks that Ἑλληνίς designates a "Gentile" or "pagan", and not a "Greek speaker."

between the original intention of Jesus and his subsequent willingness to help.

Although the words οὐ γάρ ἐστιν καλὸν λαβεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων καὶ τοῖς κυναρίοις βαλεῖν . . . (v.27) are preserved almost identically in Mt. 15:26, the preceding words ἄφες πρῶτον χορτασθῆναι τὰ τέκνα are lacking in the first Gospel. This omission has at least in part caused Bultmann<sup>1</sup> to suggest that the word πρῶτον--or possibly the whole of the phrase--was added in a later editing of the second Gospel. Although we dare not too quickly disregard Bultmann's opinion, it can be argued just as readily that 7:27a was part of the original Markan pericope. If the words ἄφες πρῶτον χορτασθῆναι τὰ τέκνα were originally a part of the Markan version, Matthew would not have been inclined to use them since they contradict his strongly Jewish statement in Mt. 15:24.<sup>2</sup> The word πρῶτον clashes with the words οὐκ ἀπεστάλην εἰ μὴ εἰς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ.

If then we are equally justified in accepting v.27a, especially the word πρῶτον, as part of the Markan

---

<sup>1</sup>History, p. 38. Cf. also Klostermann, Markus, p. 72.

<sup>2</sup>For the discussion of the Matthean form of this miracle story, cf. below, pp. 224-231.

narrative, we have here an echo of the Pauline formula in Rom. 1:16 (cf. also Rom. 2:9f.). Mark has thus affirmed the priority of the Jews over the Gentiles by indicating the setting for this affirmation in the ministry of Jesus.

When Jesus declares to the woman that "it is not right to take the children's<sup>1</sup> bread and throw it to the dogs<sup>2</sup>," she amazingly accepts his hard saying and neatly turns it to her advantage. This Gentile humbly acknowledges her allotted place but still boldly requests her portion of the bread. In the light of this (v.29-- δὲ τοῦτον τὸν λόγον . . . ) Jesus heals her daughter. The cure itself (v.30) confirms that Jesus does help the woman and that she does share in the children's bread.

Throughout the Markan Gospel the ministry of Jesus is principally among the Jews, but on occasions it is significantly widened to include Gentiles (cf. 3:7f.; 7:24; 8:27; 5:1-20). As we have observed, 7:24-30 pictures a Gentile woman who receives the help of Jesus

---

<sup>1</sup>In the Old Testament the Israelites are called God's "sons" (children). Cf. Deut. 14:1; Is. 1:2; Jer. 31:9; Hos. 11:1.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Strack-Billerbeck, vol. 1, pp. 724f., for the Rabbinic passages where the godless and the Gentiles are likened to dogs.

because of her persistent faith; in contrast, the Pharisees and scribes are accused of being hypocrites (cf. 7:1-8). While the Jewish leaders reject Jesus, the Gentiles are receptive to his activity. Although God's salvation came first to Israel, Mark was confident that the Gentiles also shared in it through faith even as this Syrophoenician woman had.

The Healing of a Deaf Mute--  
Mk. 7:31-37 (cf. Mt. 15:29-31)

Coming directly after the story of the Syrophoenician woman, 7:31-37 exhibits the usual characteristics of a miracle story: the sick one is brought to the healer (v.32a); his assistance is requested (v.32b); the condition of the patient is described (v.32a); the various techniques used for the healing are reported (v.33); a word is spoken to effect the cure (v.34); the completeness of the cure is established (v.35); and the reaction of the crowd is mentioned (v.37).

In many respects, this pericope resembles the account in 8:22-26 of the healing of the blind man and, like this other miracle story, it completes one of the Markan sections which begins with a feeding narrative



(cf. 6:30-7:37 with 8:1-26).<sup>1</sup> In each case, the healing is accomplished privately, and the publicizing of the miracle is forbidden by Jesus.<sup>2</sup> In each instance, saliva is employed, and the cure is achieved only after apparent difficulty.<sup>3</sup> We must now note how the second evangelist has used the first of these two miracle stories (7:31-37 and 8:22-26) in his Gospel.

It would appear that v.37 brings out the real import of this story, "And they were astonished beyond measure, saying, 'He has done all things well; he even makes the deaf hear and the dumb speak.'"<sup>4</sup> These words are

---

<sup>1</sup>See Taylor, Mark, pp. 368f., for the similarities in language in these parallel sections.

<sup>2</sup>In 8:26b the words μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσελθεῖν are perhaps intended to indicate that Jesus wants to avoid publicity. Although 7:36 is probably Markan, it seems likely that 8:26b was part of the original story since it refers back to v.23, which is certainly a pre-Markan feature. Cf. Luz, op.cit., p. 14.

<sup>3</sup>In 8:22-26 it is reported that Jesus must touch the man's eyes twice before he receives his full sight while in 7:31-37 the reference to Jesus' groan (v.34--ἐστέναξεν) suggests some sort of struggle.

<sup>4</sup>Dibelius, p. 76 (followed by Taylor, Mark, p. 352), supposes that v.37 was not originally part of this pericope since it appears to be a conclusion to more than just this one story. Cf. further Grundmann, Markus, p. 164, who suggests that in the pre-Markan tradition v.37 might have been a conclusion for both the story of the deaf mute (7:31-36) and the story of the blind man (8:22-26). It should be noted, however, that the "blind" are not specifically mentioned.

reminiscent of those in Is. 35:5f.,<sup>1</sup> " . . . and the ears of the deaf shall hear. . . . and the tongue of the dumb shall be distinct"<sup>2</sup> ( καὶ ὦτα κωφῶν ἀκούσονται . . . καὶ τρανὴ ἔσται γλῶσσα μογιλάλων ). It is important to note that although in v.37 the word ἄλαλος appears, in v.32 μογιλάλος is used to describe the man's difficulty with speech. Since this word (μογιλάλος) occurs only here in the New Testament and only in Is. 35:6 in the whole of the Septuagint, we have reason to believe that perhaps already in the pre-Markan tradition this story of the healing of the deaf mute was interpreted in the light of the Isaianic prophecy. It seems likely that Mark would have also recognized this Old Testament allusion.

In addition, as Lohmeyer<sup>3</sup> suggests, it is perhaps also correct to see in v.37 an allusion to the Old Testament creation story. The words καλῶς πάντα πεποίηκεν are possibly intended to be an echo of such words as

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. also Is. 29:18f.; (Ps. 38:13f.; Wisdom 10:21).

<sup>2</sup>For this translation the Septuagint passage has been followed.

<sup>3</sup>Markus, p. 151 (cf., however, Nineham, p. 202). Rawlinson, p. 101, interprets the words "He has done all things well" to mean "How exactly He fulfils the prophecies!"

those in Gen. 1:31 ( καὶ ἶδεν ὁ θεὸς τὰ πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησεν καὶ ἰδοὺ καλὰ λίαν ) and imply that in his deeds of healing Jesus is initiating the new creation. If thus both the creation story and the Isaianic prophecy are alluded to in v.37, there exists no conflict in ideas since the end times, which the prophet Isaiah was describing, and the time of the first creation are often closely associated in the Old Testament.

We must now note more carefully the other details of the story. Having both put his fingers into the man's ears and touched the man's tongue with saliva, Jesus, looking up to heaven, sighs and declares, "Be opened!" (vv.33f.).<sup>1</sup> It is then reported that, as a result, the man's ears are opened, his tongue is released and he speaks plainly (v.35). It is sometimes thought that the reference to the loosing of the man's tongue (καὶ εὐθὺς ἐλύθη ὁ δεσμὸς τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ) indicates that the man was bound by a demon, but this seems to

---

<sup>1</sup>It is noteworthy that, as in 5:41, Mark has translated the Aramaic word for his readers, in this case, ἐφφαθά. For the view that ἐφφαθά is a Hebrew word and not an Aramaic one, see I. Rabinowitz, "'Be Opened' = 'Εφφαθα (Mark 7:34): Did Jesus Speak Hebrew?," Z.N.W., 53 (1962), pp. 229-238.

involve reading too much into this one phrase.<sup>1</sup> In any case, the second evangelist has probably intended this expression and the following one (καὶ ἐλάλει ὁρθῶς)<sup>2</sup> as proofs of the man's cure.

There is reason, however, to see greater significance in Mark's use of the word κηρύσσειν in v.36. It seems likely that v.36 is due to Mark's redaction<sup>3</sup> since the original story could have fittingly closed with v.35. It has resulted in the same pattern as in 1:44f. Jesus orders that the miracles are not to be publicized but his command is disobeyed. In this instance, however, it is not the healed man who does the proclaiming (thus 1:40) but the members of the crowd

---

<sup>1</sup>Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 151, acknowledges that on the basis of Deissmann's examples (Licht vom Osten, pp. 219ff.) the phrase δεσμός της γλώσσης might be a magical term, but he denies that it is here to be associated with the idea of demonic possession. Cf. also Taylor, Mark, p. 355. J. M. Robinson, p. 40, (followed by Best, p. 34) allows that 7:35 is one Markan verse in which the traces of exorcism language can be discovered.

<sup>2</sup>According to W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (Chicago, 1957), p. 584, these words are best rendered, "and he began to speak normally."

<sup>3</sup>As Taylor, Mark, p. 352, points out, whether v.36 is judged to be Markan depends upon one's view of the Messianic secret. Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 149; Grundmann, Markus, p. 156; and Haenchen, Der Weg, p. 277, all suppose v.36 to be Markan.

( αὐτοί . . . ἐκήρυσσον ).<sup>1</sup> In the light of v.37, it seems obvious what the content of their preaching was--Jesus is the Messiah whose coming signifies restoration for his people.

In this story neither the faith of the patient nor that of those who bring him to Jesus is mentioned. Rather, as we have seen, the actions and word of Jesus receive the major emphasis. In other words, it is the miracle itself which would have absorbed the attention of the hearer of 7:31-37. In addition, by means of the last verse Mark has clearly presented Jesus as the Messianic fulfiller who in the words of the Isaianic prophecy makes the deaf to hear and the dumb to speak.

The Feeding of the Four Thousand--  
Mk. 8:1-10 (Mt. 15:32-39)

Like the first feeding miracle, 8:1-10 takes place in a deserted location (cf. 6:31,35; 8:4) and is linked with the compassion of Jesus (6:34; 8:2). In addition, both accounts report the perplexity of the disciples about the provision of food for the multitude in the

---

<sup>1</sup>Although the crowd is not specifically mentioned in vv.36f., the plural forms probably refer to the members of the crowd even though it is reported that the healing took place in private (cf. v.33). Does Mark intend this crowd to be at least partially composed of Gentiles? Cf. Lagrange, Marc, p. 200.



wilderness (6:37 and 8:4), the inquiry of Jesus about the available supplies (6:38 and 8:5), Jesus' command that the crowd be seated (6:39 and 8:6), his offering of thanks before the distribution of the bread and the fish (6:41 and 8:6b-7), the satisfaction of the people (6:42 and 8:8), the gathering of the left-over fragments (6:43 and 8:8b) and the size of the crowd which was present (6:44 and 8:9).

In spite of this agreement in the general course of events there exist some striking differences between 6:30-44 and 8:1-10.<sup>1</sup> There are, of course, the obvious differences in vocabulary (e.g., εὐχαριστήσας in 8:6 for εὐλόγησεν in 6:41) and numbers (in 8:1-10 there are seven loaves to feed 4000 people with seven baskets of fragments remaining while in 6:30-44 there are five loaves and two fish to feed 5000 men with twelve baskets of food left over<sup>2</sup>). In addition, the following should

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Grundmann, Markus, pp. 158f.

<sup>2</sup>It is sometimes supposed that the number twelve in 6:30-44 represents either the twelve apostles and/or the twelve tribes of Israel while the number seven in 8:1-10 refers to the seven deacons in the early Hellenistic Church (cf. Acts 6:3). A. Farrer, "Loaves and Thousands," J.T.S., n.s. 4 (1953), pp. 1-14, definitely goes beyond the evidence in constructing his ingenious theory on the basis of the numbers in Mark. For a critical evaluation of Farrer's thesis, cf. Burkill, pp. 24-27.

be noted: (a) in 6:35 the disciples are the ones who bring up the subject of the crowd's need for food, but in 8:1f. Jesus himself initiates the action which eventuates in the feeding; (b) in the former case, the compassion of Jesus seems to be linked to the spiritual condition of the people and he responds by teaching them, but in 8:2f. his compassion is obviously prompted by the physical need of the crowd; and, finally, (c) unlike the first feeding narrative, where the fish are mentioned four times (cf. 6:38,41,43), the second contains only one reference to the fish (8:7).

Since the agreement between the two stories is too striking to conclude that they recount separate events,<sup>1</sup> it seems likely that the variations exist because here Mark has incorporated into his Gospel two versions of the feeding story, each one coming to him from a different stream of the tradition. Presumably, Mark would have been much less concerned than we are in the present day to ask whether 6:30-44 and 8:1-10 represented duplicate material;<sup>2</sup> nevertheless, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the second evangelist would have known

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. above, p. 60.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Lightfoot, History, p. 115.

something about the traditions out of which the two accounts came. If this were the case, has he included 6:30-44 and 8:1-10 for a specific reason?

After a quite thorough investigation of the Markan feeding narratives, van Iersel<sup>1</sup> concludes that there is sufficient reason to infer that Mark has employed the two feeding miracles to illustrate that the Table of the Lord is now open to the Gentiles as well as the Jews. As a basis for this conclusion he attempts to show that 6:35-44 probably received its form in the Palestinian tradition while 8:1-9 evidently came to Mark from the Hellenistic community. Further, he concludes that both accounts had already been associated with the Church's Eucharist prior to Mark.

Van Iersel<sup>2</sup> finds the key to Mark's understanding of the two feeding narratives in the story of the Syro-phenician woman. According to him, by inserting the words ἄφες πρῶτον χορτασθῆναι τὰ τέκνα into 7:27 Mark has deliberately linked 7:24-30 to the two feeding narratives,

---

<sup>1</sup>Op. cit., pp. 167-194.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 188f. Van Iersel observes that the word χορτάζειν appears only in these three places in the second Gospel (7:27a; 6:42; 8:8). It should be noted, however, that the word occurs also in 8:4. Cf. also Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, p. 113.

thereby demonstrating that both the Jews and the Gentiles share in the Eucharist. In 6:30-44 Jesus feeds a Jewish crowd while in 8:1-10 he provides food for Gentiles.

It would seem that van Iersel is justified in concluding that certain features in 8:1-10, which vary considerably from the first feeding narrative,<sup>1</sup> have resulted from a Hellenistic influence and have presumably entered the story at a later stage in the tradition. For example, it can be noted that the use of the word εὐχαριστήσας in 8:6 instead of εὐλόγησεν (cf. 6:41) betrays a preference of the Greek-speaking world (cf. I Cor. 11:24 and Lk. 22:19)<sup>2</sup> and that in 8:7 the word εὐλογεῖν is given an object (αὐτό), a practice which

---

<sup>1</sup>It is generally agreed that the first feeding account has more of a Jewish flavour and is portrayed as taking place on Jewish soil. Even if Mark has inserted v.34, the reference to the shepherdless multitude recalls an Old Testament picture and would have been intended by him to describe a predominately Jewish crowd. (Cf. van Iersel, op. cit., p. 189). For another view, cf. G. H. Boobyer, "The Miracles of the Loaves and the Gentiles in St. Mark's Gospel," S.J.Th., 6 (1953), pp. 77-87. Boobyer insists that both 6:35-44 and 8:1-10 are feedings for the Gentiles.

<sup>2</sup>Thus van Iersel, op. cit., p. 184. Cf. esp. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, pp. 175, 185. It should also be noted that Mark himself has employed the word εὐχαριστεῖν in connexion with the giving of the wine in his account of the Lord's Supper (14:23).

would not have been followed by a Jewish writer.<sup>1</sup> In addition, 8:1-10 exhibits a certain conciseness which is not seen in 6:35-44,<sup>2</sup> and without v.7--which undoubtedly stems from a different hand from that responsible for v.6<sup>3</sup>--8:1-10 contains no reference to the fish. If v.7 were added either by Mark or prior to him by a Hellenistic redactor in order to bring the second narrative into line with 6:35-44, then previous to that time this story would have been more closely paralleled to the Eucharist. Both this feature and the conciseness of 8:1-10 suggest a later stage in the tradition<sup>4</sup> as indeed does the fact that in 8:1-10 it is Jesus who initiates the action (cf. 6:35). This latter feature is possibly the result of theological

---

<sup>1</sup>Thus van Iersel, op. cit., pp. 176f., 185. Cf. esp. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, pp. 97, 175.

<sup>2</sup>The references to the green grass (6:39), the size of the seated groups (6:40), Jesus' glance heavenward (6:41), and the gathering of the fragments of the fish (6:43) are details which are found only in the first feeding narrative.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. van Iersel, op. cit., pp. 176f., who notes that in v.7 the word εὐλογῆσαι (with an object) occurs and not εὐχαριστῆσαι as in v.6.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. below, pp. 504f.



reflection.<sup>1</sup>

If then we can conclude with some certainty that Mark has in this second instance (8:1-10) utilized a story of the feeding which came to him from a predominately Hellenistic environment and has incorporated it into a section of his Gospel which is apparently intended to recount the activity of Jesus in non-Palestinian territory (7:24,31),<sup>2</sup> is it then correct to suppose with van Iersel that Mark has intended the words in 7:27a to be the key to his particular interpretation of 6:30-44 and 8:1-10?

It is, of course, possible that 7:24-30 has gone through certain stages of development or, to be more precise, that it was formerly a straightforward miracle story into which the conversational element (vv.27f.) has been introduced. It would seem, however, that by suggesting that Mark has probably inserted the words καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ into v.29a to take up the words in v.27

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. van Iersel, op. cit., p. 186. Van Iersel's conclusions that the phrase in 8:3b καὶ μαρτύρεται is an allusion to the Gentiles, or more precisely to those of the Hellenistic Church [as suggested by F. W. Danker, "Mark 8:3," J.B.L., 82 (1963), pp. 215f.], and that the role of the "twelve disciples" is played down in 8:1-10 seem to be far less certain.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Taylor, Mark, p. 357.

(καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτῇ) --which were formerly continued with the word ὑπαγε . . . (v.29)--and then has added διὰ τοῦτο τὸν λόγον in order to connect the miracle with the conversation in vv.27f., van Iersel<sup>1</sup> is, in fact, saying that it was the second evangelist who was responsible for giving this pericope its present form. In other words, this would mean that prior to Mark's redaction this story would not have included the conversation between Jesus and the woman in vv.27f. and thus its major theme.

In the light of the fact that Mark's redaction is normally detectable in the verses which connect the various pericopae and not in the middle of a story, it seems likely that 7:24-30 came to the second evangelist already containing vv.27f. For this reason, van Iersel's suggestion that 7:27a is a Markan insertion seems to be a questionable one. There is no more reason for supposing that these words constitute a Markan interpolation than that the whole of vv.27f. does. If, in fact, Mark had taken the trouble to create this somewhat subtle link among these three passages by means of the word χορτάζειν (6:42; 7:27; 8:8), it seems sensible to suppose

---

<sup>1</sup>Op. cit., pp. 188f.

that he would have designated more straightforwardly both the location of the second feeding in Gentile territory and the respective compositions of the two crowds--i.e., Jewish and Gentile.

In a recent study of 7:24-30, Burkill<sup>1</sup> rejects the view which proposes that 7:27a suggests that the second evangelist has intended 6:30-44 and 8:1-10 to be seen respectively as a feeding of the Jews and a feeding of the Gentiles. He does think, however, that both the feeding narratives and 7:27 were definitely associated with the Eucharist. According to him, Mark has employed 7:27f. to shed light on 6:30-44 and 8:1-10 on the basis of the references to the great quantity of left-over food. He says,

In each instance, therefore, a crowd is adequately served with food, and there is ample left by those who partake of the meal to satisfy the needs of others; and this is the point made by the woman in the adroit reply of 7:28--the crumbs that fall from the children's table are sufficient to provide the dogs with a meal.<sup>2</sup>

Like van Iersel, Burkill allows that 7:27 is to be associated with the two feeding narratives in the light of the Church's Eucharist, but, unlike van Iersel, he

---

<sup>1</sup>Z.N.W., 57 (1966), pp. 29f.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 30.

sees no reason to conclude that Mark has intended to picture a feeding of the Jews (6:30-44) and then a feeding of the Gentiles (8:1-10). Burkill's reasons for rejecting this latter possibility do not appear to be completely defensible since he seems to expect a consistency in Mark's thought in regard to time and events and at the same time assumes that the second evangelist would not have been mechanically consistent in other respects.<sup>1</sup> In any case, it would seem that if Mark has intended 7:27f. to be linked with feedings of multitudes at all, it was only in a general way.

What then can we conclude about the Markan plan in relation to these passages? It seems probable that the second evangelist has seen both 6:30-44 and 8:1-10 as prefigurations of the Eucharist;<sup>2</sup> moreover, it appears

---

<sup>1</sup>Since Jesus' pronouncement in 7:27a seems to suggest that " . . . the process of feeding the Israelites is not an event of the past but is still proceeding," Burkill, Z.N.W., 57 (1966), pp. 29f., concludes that Mark could not have intended 6:30-44 as a feeding for the Jews since it was a past event. In so far as the two feedings were taken as prefiguring the Eucharist, the crowd in each case must be intended as a racially mixed group since, according to Burkill, 7:27f. means that the Jews and the Gentiles eat simultaneously. It seems unlikely that Mark would have been overly concerned to be this precise.

<sup>2</sup>A. Shaw, "The Marcan Feeding Narratives," Church Quarterly Review, 162 (1961), pp. 268-278, also couples the two feeding miracles with the Eucharist. He attempts to identify 6:30-44 specifically with the first Supper

to be even more certain that Mark has intended vv.27f. in the story of the Syrophoenician woman to demonstrate that the Gentiles also have a share in the Kingdom. Presumably he would have seen the reference to bread in respect to the Gentiles' participation at the Lord's Table. Further, the *πρῶτον* in 7:27a suggests the priority of the Jews over the Gentiles (cf. Rom. 1:16), and, as we have noted, the contexts of the feeding narratives imply that the first one takes place in Jewish territory and the second in a non-Palestinian area. We have also concluded that 8:1-10 exhibits much less of a Jewish flavour than 6:30-44. Nonetheless, whether Mark has intended to link 7:27f. specifically to 6:30-44 and 8:1-10 cannot be determined.

In addition to the Eucharistic association, we have seen that the second evangelist has used 8:1-10 to present Jesus as the divine figure who miraculously provides for the needs of the people. He has undoubtedly intended this story to provide another illustration of the power

---

celebrated by Jesus and his chosen disciples and 8:1-10 with the subsequent celebration of the Eucharist in the Church. His argument, however, is not entirely convincing.



of the Son of God. In view of 8:14-21,<sup>1</sup> it is also evident that Mark has deliberately linked both 8:1-10 and 6:30-44 to the question involving the disciples' understanding of the import of Jesus' miracles (cf. also 6:52).

Subsequent to the sign-seeking mission of the Pharisees (8:11f.) Jesus warns his disciples of the leaven of the Pharisees and that of Herod, but they misunderstand the word ζύμη and assume that Jesus is talking about bread. The disciples have forgotten to bring bread with them in the boat except for one loaf (v.14--καὶ εἰ μὴ ἓνα ἄρτον οὐκ εἶχον μεθ' ἑαυτῶν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ). In spite of the disciples' concern over tangible bread, Jesus does not endeavour to correct their misunderstanding but takes up their thought and quizzes them regarding the meaning of the two feedings. With the minimum of supplies Jesus had met the needs of the 5000 as well as those of the 4000, and in each instance there was plenty to spare.

---

<sup>1</sup>Although the second evangelist has presumably incorporated in 8:15 a pre-Markan element (see Lightfoot, History, p. 115), the remainder of this section is apparently the work of his hand. Thus Best, p. 78; Johnson, Mark, p. 142; Grant, I.B., vol. 7, p. 761. Cf. also Schmidt, pp. 204f.

Thus by means of 8:14-21 Mark has again spotlighted the disciples' nearsightedness. They are worried about the deficiency of their food supply at the very moment when they sit in the presence of the One who has just demonstrated his power to provide for man's nourishment.<sup>1</sup> They fail to recognize who Jesus is--a theme to which Mark devotes his attention from this point onwards in his Gospel. Thus, we can say in conclusion that although for Mark the feeding miracles secondarily possessed Eucharistic significance, they primarily had Christological meaning: they reveal who Jesus is-- a truth which the disciples do not comprehend.

The Healing of a Blind Man--Mk. 8:22-26

This miracle story is peculiar to the second Gospel (cf. Jn. 9:1-7), but it has certain features in common with the healing of the deaf mute in 7:31-37.<sup>2</sup> The

---

<sup>1</sup>J. Mánek, "Mark viii 14-21," N.T., 7 (March, 1964), pp. 10-14, suggests that ἄρτος in 8:14b would possibly have been understood by Mark as a reference (in Johannine terms) to "the Bread of Life" who was in their midst. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, p. 234, makes the same suggestion. Cf. also Burkill, p. 107.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. above, pp. 80f.

agreement between these two stories has caused Bultmann<sup>1</sup> to conclude that 8:22-26 is a variant of 7:31-37, but Taylor<sup>2</sup> draws attention to striking differences which are not readily explained if it is assumed that both accounts refer to the same incident. Taylor lists the following: (a) in 7:34 the word ἀναβλέψας refers to Jesus' glance up to heaven but in 8:24 it describes the blind man's raising his eyes; (b) unlike 7:34 the story of the healing of the blind man reports no healing word of Jesus but rather Jesus asks the man the question, "Do you see anything?"<sup>3</sup>; (c) the peculiar reply of the blind man (v.24-- βλέπω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ὅτι ὡς δένδρα ὁρῶ περιπατοῦντας )<sup>4</sup> is distinctive and not likely to have arisen in a variant; and (d) the second reference to Jesus' laying on of hands in 8:25 is " . . . without parallel

---

<sup>1</sup>History, p. 227. It should be noted that Bultmann (History, pp. 64f.) dismisses this reported journey (7:24; 7:31; 8:22) as a "phantasy."

<sup>2</sup>Mark, pp. 369f. (followed by Cranfield, p. 263).

<sup>3</sup>The variant reading in  $\Sigma$   $\mathcal{R}$   $\rho^l$  (εἴ τι βλέπει) which is in indirect speech should be noted.

<sup>4</sup>For the rendering of this difficult phrase, cf. Taylor, Mark, p. 371, and M. Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts (2nd ed.; Oxford, 1954), pp. 36f.

in the Gospels and is not likely to have been invented."<sup>1</sup>

It appears quite certain that 7:31-37 and 8:22-26 were paired in the earliest tradition as illustrations of the Messianic fulfilment, particularly as it is set forth in certain Isaianic passages (cf. Is. 29:18, 35:5f.).<sup>2</sup> This fact could account for some of the similarities between the two stories.<sup>3</sup> Having ended the previous section (6:30-7:37) by demonstrating that Jesus is the One who unstops the ears of the deaf and makes

---

<sup>1</sup>Taylor, Mark, p. 369. It is also improbable that Mark would have created 8:22-26 on the basis of 7:31-37. The word ὄμμα occurs only here in Mark (cf. Mt. 20:34) while ὀφθαλμός appears in 7:22; 8:18; 9:47 (twice); 12:11; and 14:40 as well as in 8:25. Since the second evangelist has definitely favoured the word ὀφθαλμός (its occurrence in 8:18 is probably due to his redaction), it seems unlikely that the other word for "eyes" (ὄμματα) in 8:23 is also redactional although this would be the case if 8:22-26 were constructed by Mark as a variant of 7:31-37.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. above, pp. 80-85, for the interpretation of 7:31-37 and a fuller consideration of the Old Testament background.

<sup>3</sup>Taylor, Mark, pp. 369f., in addition to suggesting that the agreements between 7:31-37 and 8:22-26 might be due, at least in part, to the stereotyped forms of the oral period, allows that if Mark were intentionally linking the two stories, he might have simply repeated himself. It should be observed that most commentators take the words καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Βηθσαϊδάν in v.22a to be Markan (thus Bultmann, History, p. 213; Klostermann, Markus, p. 77; Lohmeyer, Markus, pp. 158f.; and Best, p. 79; cf. also Schmidt, pp. 207f.), but most of them do not attempt to decide what else might be redactional (Bultmann, History, p. 213, does assume that v.26b is editorial).

the dumb to speak, Mark has completed the second group of pericopae which begins with a feeding miracle by means of this story.

As in 7:31-37, Mark has not emphasized the theme of faith. The words καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτῷ τυφλόν, καὶ παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτόν are probably not intended to be a demonstration of the faith of those who bring the man but provide a characteristic beginning for a miracle story. Further we observe that the man's condition is simply designated as blindness (cf. Jn. 9:1-- τυφλὸν ἐκ γενετῆς) and that his faith is nowhere mentioned. In the light of this absence of the faith theme, it is pure speculation to suppose, as does Gould,<sup>1</sup> that the step by step recovery of the man's sight corresponds to the gradual growth of his faith.

Undoubtedly, as in 7:31-37, Mark has been concerned to emphasize the miracle itself. Indeed, this is the first miracle in which the second evangelist has pictured Jesus restoring eyesight to the blind (cf. also 10:46-52), and he has described it in picturesque fashion. Although 8:22-26 includes no healing word (cf. 7:34) and no final chorus emphasizing the miracle (cf. 7:37), the means which Jesus employed to effect the cure are described.

---

<sup>1</sup>Pp. 149f.



Not only does Jesus touch the man's eyes but he also uses saliva (8:23; cf. 7:33). After the man sees everything clearly, Jesus sends him to his home, charging him, "Do not even enter the village" (v.26). Although this ending is probably pre-Markan, it is to be connected with Mark's secrecy motif.<sup>1</sup>

The two-stage healing is of particular import in this story. After Jesus touches the blind man's eyes with saliva (v.23), the man does not immediately regain his eyesight; rather, he can merely see men as trees walking (v.24). It is only subsequent to Jesus' second touch that the man sees clearly. Has Mark referred to this two-stage cure simply to stress the extreme difficulty of this case and thus the greatness of Jesus' power<sup>2</sup> or has he recounted it for another reason?

We have already rejected the conclusion that this step by step procedure is intended to correspond to the growing faith of the blind man. Further, it seems doubtful that by noting that the man was able to see men as trees walking Mark was concerned to show that he

---

<sup>1</sup>The numerous variant readings for μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσέλθης show how difficult these words were for the early interpreters. Cf. C. H. Turner, "Marcan Usage," *J.T.S.*, 26 (1925), p. 18.

<sup>2</sup>Thus Haenchen, *Der Weg*, p. 291.

was not blind from birth.<sup>1</sup>

When considering why the second evangelist has retained this two-stage miracle in his Gospel van der Loos assumes that Calvin's explanation--this unusual miracle story demonstrates that Jesus was not bound to any set procedure since he healed first in one way and then in another--is closest to the truth. In accepting Calvin's conclusion van der Loos rejects interpretations which suggest that Mark has understood this miracle story symbolically. He states,

Jesus did not heal the man for the purpose of demonstrating to him the "sign" that a not yet complete belief is answered by an originally incomplete cure--not a single word is said about the man's faith!--or to teach the disciples symbolically, but in part to manifest in His display of divine mercy to a man in need the omnipotence of His actions and His freedom in the method of treatment.<sup>2</sup>

Although we agree with van der Loos's rejection of the first suggestion, we cannot concur with his outright denial of the symbolic interpretation of this story. It is not at all clear whether van der Loos means that the historical Jesus did not effect this miracle in two stages in order to provide a lesson for his disciples or

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Taylor, Mark, p. 371, and van der Loos, p. 420.

<sup>2</sup>Pp. 421f. Cf. also Rawlinson, p. 108.

that the second evangelist himself has not included it in his Gospel with such purpose in mind. It seems that van der Loos is more concerned with the former matter. Although, of course, it is impossible to uncover the original historical event, we would maintain that Mark's use of this story is definitely related to the blindness of the disciples of Jesus.

When we examine the context of this story, we find additional support for this conclusion. In 6:51f. Mark has indicated that the disciples' astonishment and ignorance are related to their hardness of heart; in 7:18 they are again rebuked for their lack of understanding; in 8:4 when confronted by Jesus prior to the second feeding of the crowd they inquire, "How can one feed these men with bread here in the desert?"; in 8:15ff. Jesus warns them of the leaven of the Pharisees (cf. 8:11f.) and of that of Herod (cf. 6:14ff.) and is amazed at their lack of understanding; and, finally, in 8:18 he specifically accuses them of having eyes and yet not seeing and having ears and yet not hearing.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>J. B. Tyson, "The Blindness of the Disciples in Mark," *J.B.L.*, 80 (1961), pp. 261-268, contends that Mark has highlighted the blindness of the disciples since he thought that even after the Resurrection the original disciples did not adequately comprehend the meaning of Jesus' death. According to him, Mark thought that the Jerusalem Church was a narrow and Jewish version of Christianity.

Since the second evangelist has obviously emphasized the spiritual blindness of Jesus' disciples, it does not seem inappropriate to suggest that Mark has intended 8:22-26 as a prefiguration of that which Jesus was to do for his disciples, especially when we note that the Caesarea Philippi episode in which the disciples (i.e., Peter) recognize Jesus' Messiahship for the first time follows directly. Drawing attention to the observation of Lightfoot,<sup>1</sup> Best stresses the parallelism between these two pericopae:

. . . in the immediately succeeding pericope (viii. 27-30) Peter "sees" Jesus as the Christ. Lightfoot has drawn attention to the close parallels between viii. 22-6 and viii. 27-30, implying that Mark has deliberately placed this healing story in order to underline the confession of Peter. But the blind man receives his sight in two stages; Peter in viii. 27-30 does not yet "see" fully; he sees Jesus as Messiah, the first stage, but is unwilling to accept what the Messianic ministry involves for Jesus, the second stage. It will require the Resurrection before he is completely restored; hence Peter's confession is followed by<sup>2</sup> the story of the Transfiguration (ix. 2-8).

---

<sup>1</sup>History, pp. 90f.

<sup>2</sup>P. 108. Cf. also A. Kuby, "Zur Konzeption des Markus-Evangeliums," Z.N.W., 49 (1958), p. 54: ". . . der Evangelist sucht die irdische Wirklichkeit Jesu, des Messias, mit dem die Königsherrschaft Gottes angebrochen ist, dadurch dramatisch zu veranschaulichen, dass er dieser Wirklichkeit--die entgegen allen Erwartungen den Kreuzestod einschliesst--zuerst das

It would seem that Best rightly links the event of Peter's total vision to the time after the Resurrection (cf. 9:9). Not only has the second evangelist indicated that Peter misunderstands a suffering Messiah (8:31-33; cf. further 8:34-37), but he has also drawn attention to the disciples' blindness which persists even after the Transfiguration (cf. 9:10; 9:32; 9:33-35; 10:35-45). In fact, Mark has probably intentionally ended this entire section of his Gospel (8:22-10:52) with the account of the second healing of a blind man, Bartimaeus, who when he receives his sight follows Jesus "on the way" into the events of the Passion (cf. 10:52b).

We have observed that the healing of the blind man (8:22-26), as that of the deaf mute (7:31-37), has been skilfully employed by Mark in the plan of his Gospel. Each story emphasizes the miracle accomplished by Jesus, and each must be understood in light of the Old Testament

---

Nichtverstehen der Messianität Jesu auf Seiten seiner Jünger und dann--erstmalig 8:32--ihr Missverstehen, d.h. das Nichtverstehen des Leidenmüssens, gegenüberstellt." A. Farrer, A Study in St. Mark (London, 1951), pp. 105f., likewise understands Peter's confession only as the first stage since the disciple does not comprehend the Son of man role. Richardson, pp. 85-88, similarly accepts this symbolic interpretation of both 8:22-26 and 8:27-31 but evidently detects no significance in the two-stage cure. See also Lagrange, Marc, pp. 213f., and Nineham, pp. 218f.



prophecy announcing the Messianic age (Is. 29:18f.; Is. 35:5f.). The healing of the blind man, however, is singular in that it is performed in two stages, and by connecting it with 8:27-30 Mark has anticipated the miracle of sight which Jesus was to work for his disciples. Their vision also came in two stages since they did not see clearly until after the Resurrection.

The Healing of the Possessed Child--  
Mk. 9:14-29 (Mt. 17:14-20; Lk. 9:37-43a)

9:14-29 is the third example in Mark of an exorcism narrative in which Jesus' authority over the evil spirits is emphasized, but in this instance the power of Jesus stands in direct contrast to the disciples' lack of it--they are unable to cast the spirit out of the boy. The story itself proceeds in a picturesque fashion, describing on two occasions both the condition of the boy (vv.17b,18a and vv.21b,22a) and the convulsions caused by the spirit (v.20 and v.26a).<sup>1</sup> As in 1:25f. (cf. 5:13), Jesus rebukes the unclean spirit,<sup>2</sup> saying in this

---

<sup>1</sup>Bultmann, History, p. 211, concludes that this pericope has resulted from the combination of two pre-Markan accounts, the first occupying roughly vv.14-20 and the second vv.21-27. If Bultmann is correct, this would help to explain the diversified nature of the narrative.

<sup>2</sup>For the use of ἐπιτιμᾶν in Mark, see above, p. 39.

instance, "You dumb and deaf spirit, I command you, come out of him and never enter him again" (v.25). Having caused a violent convulsion, the spirit comes out of the boy, leaving him as though he were dead. This causes most of the witnesses to say, "He is dead" (v.26). Jesus then responds by raising the boy up and in this way completes the miracle (v.27).<sup>1</sup>

It should be observed that, unlike 1:23-27 and 5:1-20, this exorcism narrative reports no acknowledgment by the evil spirits of Jesus' divine nature. Although it could be argued that the fact that the spirit is dumb logically excludes such a confession and that the spirit's convulsion at the sight of Jesus in v.20 was meant to suggest its recognition of Jesus as the enemy, it seems likely that at this point in his Gospel Mark has not been concerned to emphasize the special knowledge of the demons. No longer are they the only ones who recognize Jesus since the disciples now know that he is the Messiah (8:27-30). It is possible, therefore, that Mark has not included 9:14-29 for the same reason as that for both 1:23-27 and 5:1-20.

---

<sup>1</sup>J. M. Robinson, p. 39, (cf. Nineham, pp. 243f.) sees a "resurrection" motif in vv.26f. See also Manson, Js. the Messiah, p. 46.

Another principal theme is evident elsewhere in this pericope--in the words of Jesus in v.19, during the scene between Jesus and the father in vv.22b-24, and in the final conversation between Jesus and his disciples in vv.28f. In each instance the focus is not directly upon the healing of the boy but upon the general theme of faith. This theme is first introduced in v.18b, where reference is made to the disciples' inability to cast out the demon from the boy.

Since the question of Jesus, "O faithless generation,<sup>1</sup> how long am I to be with you? How long am I to bear with you?", directly follows the father's announcement regarding the failure of the disciples in Jesus' absence, it is possible that Mark has intended these words exclusively as an indictment against the disciples.<sup>2</sup> There is the other possibility, however, that these words indicate that Jesus' charge is also against the crowd and

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Deut. 32:5,20. P. L. Couchoud, "Notes sur le texte de St. Marc dans le Codex Chester Beatty," J.T.S., 35 (January, 1934), p. 17, (followed by Taylor, Mark, p. 398) accepts the reading καὶ διεστραμμένη (p<sup>45</sup> W φ) as original.

<sup>2</sup>Gould, p. 168, and van der Loos, p. 399, both suppose that these words of Jesus in v.19 are spoken only against the disciples. In contrast, Taylor, Mark, p. 398; Johnson, Mark, p. 161; Rawlinson, p. 124; Schniewind, Markus, p. 125; Lohmeyer, Markus, pp. 186f.; Nineham, p. 243; Grundmann, Markus, pp. 189f.; and

the father since the word *reveá* suggests a wider application (cf. 8:12; 8:38 and 13:30). In support of this conclusion it should be noted that in v.24 the father confesses his unbelief.

Nonetheless, what is remarkable in this instance is the assertion that even Jesus' disciples are members of an unbelieving generation. Including the disciples in this indictment would not, for Mark, be inappropriate since he has already pictured them as faithless in 4:40 and without understanding in 6:52 and 8:17f.

The question of faith and unbelief is elsewhere brought out in the course of the conversation between Jesus and the father in vv.22b-24. Unlike the words of the leper in 1:40 ( ὅτι ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασαι με καθαρίσαι ), the words of the father express doubt concerning Jesus' ability to heal ( ἀλλ' εἴ τι δύνη ). The failure of Jesus' disciples to cast out the demon has probably caused the man's uncertainty.<sup>1</sup> But in the story Jesus directs the

---

Lagrange, Marc, p. 239, all apparently understand Jesus' words in v.19 as a broad indictment against that generation and not one directed only against the disciples. Although the reference to the scribes in v.14 is abrupt, it is possible that Mark would have viewed their debating with the disciples as a sign of the "faithless generation" (cf. 8:12).

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 186; Taylor, Mark, p. 398; and Grundmann, Markus, p. 189.

words of the father back to him (v.23), causing him to confess his faltering faith and unbelief: "I believe, help my unbelief!"<sup>1</sup>

Finally, we must take note of vv.28f., which show signs of Mark's redaction<sup>2</sup> and in which the second evangelist has drawn attention to the theme of faith. In the privacy of a house the disciples inquire of Jesus why they were unable to cast out the evil spirit. Jesus replies that such kind can only be driven out by prayer.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Although the words in v.23 ("All things are possible to him who believes.") have sometimes been interpreted by commentators as alluding to the faith which enables Jesus to accomplish this miracle (thus van der Loos, p. 400, and Schniewind, Markus, p. 125), it seems better to relate them to the father in light of his response (v.24). In the second Gospel faith is consistently set forth as the condition which is necessary for men in order that they might be open to God's activity (cf. 2:5; 5:34; 5:36; 10:52). In other words, all things become possible for men of faith (cf. also 11:22f.) since all things are indeed possible with God (cf. 10:27). Cf. C. E. B. Cranfield, "St. Mark 9:14-29," S.J.Th., 3 (1950), pp. 61ff. Cf. also Fuller, Miracles, p. 62.

<sup>2</sup>For example, the house motif (cf. 9:33 and 10:10; see also 7:24) and the words *κατ' ἰδίαν* (cf. 4:34; 6:31f.; 7:33; 9:2; 13:3) are characteristic of Mark's style. Most commentators (Bultmann, History, p. 211; Klostermann, Markus, p. 89; Taylor, Mark, p. 401) suppose that vv.28f. were not part of the pre-Markan pericope. Haenchen, Der Weg, p. 319, thinks that these words were added subsequent to the time of Mark, but there exists too much agreement between v.28 and Mt. 17:19 to warrant this conclusion.

<sup>3</sup>Some manuscripts add *καὶ νηστεία*. Cf. Grundmann, Markus, pp. 191f.



Since prayer would reveal the complete reliance of the healer on God,<sup>1</sup> this action undoubtedly became an essential part of the healing process in the ministry of the early Church. The gift of healing was conferred on the early Christian community (cf. I Cor. 12:9b,10a), including authority over the demonic (cf. 6:7; Acts 16:16-18), and it appears that by means of vv.28f. Mark has intended to provide an answer to the perplexing question: "Why are certain attempts to cast out demons unsuccessful?" In this story Mark has shown that the authority to cast out demons is not an assumed right of the disciples of the Lord but is linked to their dependence on God through prayer.

Although, as we have seen, there is no unified theme in this pericope, it is evident that Mark has deliberately contrasted the success of Jesus with the failure of the disciples, i.e., faith with unbelief,<sup>2</sup> and by means of vv.28f. has especially adapted this exorcism narrative to the general theme of discipleship, a theme which is important to the immediate context. Although this story

---

<sup>1</sup>"Faith" and "prayer" are also closely associated in 11:22-25.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Best, p. 106, who writes: " . . . indeed in this whole pericope the method of Jesus is contrasted with the method, or the lack of it, of the disciples."

was probably annexed to the story of the Transfiguration in the pre-Markan tradition,<sup>1</sup> it is difficult to detect any theological significance in this connexion.<sup>2</sup> It is more important to note that 9:14-29 appears in the larger section (8:27-10:52) in which Mark has pictured Jesus explaining the deeper meaning of his Messiahship and its relationship to obedient discipleship.<sup>3</sup>

This further exorcism story which highlights Jesus' power over the demonic world has thus probably been preserved by Mark because it contains a lesson about faith

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Schmidt, pp. 227f. In contrast, Nineham, p. 242, concludes that Mark has placed this exorcism narrative into its present context since v.14 exhibits his own composition. Nineham does not, however, indicate the specific features which have caused him to judge v.14 to be Markan.

<sup>2</sup>Some commentators (Lightfoot, History, p. 78; Grant, I.B., vol. 7, p. 779; Schniewind, Markus, p. 125) draw attention to the striking contrast between the mountain of revelation and the valley of misery while others (Menzies, op. cit., p. 178; Johnson, Mark, p. 161; J. Bowman, op. cit., pp. 199f.) assume that the setting in 9:2-29 is suggested by the Exodus story (cf. Exod. 32:15-24). In any case, 9:2-8 accounts for the necessary absence of Jesus from his nine disciples.

<sup>3</sup>After Peter's confession in 8:29 Mark has incorporated only two miracle stories (9:14-29 and 10:46-52) besides the story of the cursing of the fig tree (11:12-14, 20-25). Both of these stories are related to the theme of discipleship. Cf. H. Riesenfeld, "Tradition und Redaktion im Markusevangelium," Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann ("Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 21"; Berlin, 1957), pp. 163f.

and discipleship. The first followers of Jesus, as well as those Christians for whom Mark has written, were undoubtedly often plagued by uncertainties and doubts which on occasions would have resulted in their failure to exercise the authority granted them in their ministry for others. This story would have continually held up before them the promise that all things were possible if they only trusted that One who continued his healing ministry through them.

The Healing of Bartimaeus--Mk. 10:46-52  
(Mt. 20:29-34; Lk. 18:35-43)

It is obvious that 10:46-52 does not exhibit all the usual features of a miracle story; this is particularly apparent in the conclusion where there is no mention of the crowd's reaction but merely a reference to the fact that the healed man follows Jesus on the way (v.52).<sup>1</sup> As the words of Jesus in the first half of v.52 demonstrate, the major emphasis in this story is on the theme of faith. After the blind man asks to receive his eyesight, Jesus responds by declaring, "Go your way; your faith has made you well" (cf. 5:34).

---

<sup>1</sup>It should be noted that Dibelius (p. 43) does not classify 10:46-52 as a tale but as a paradigm of "a less pure type." Cf. also Taylor, Mark, p. 447.

Then the cure itself is noted by means of a single word ἀνέβλεψεν (ἀνέβλεψεν is undoubtedly intended as an echo of the final words of the blind man's request in v.51--ἵνα ἀναβλέψω). In view of both this feature and the fact that in this instance no reference is made to Jesus' techniques for healing, it would appear that the phrase ὤπαγε, ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε is used as a substitute for Jesus' direct word of healing power.<sup>1</sup> Jesus commends the man's faith, and with that the blind man receives his sight.

Since in this story the theme of faith is of greater importance than the details of the healing itself, we need to note the ways in which this principal theme is stressed. First of all, it is to be observed that, in contrast to the story in 8:22-26, where the blind man is brought to Jesus by others, here Bartimaeus<sup>2</sup> himself initiates the action by crying for help when he learns that Jesus, the Nazarene, is passing by (v.47). But what is more significant than this is the fact that Bartimaeus uses a Christological title in addressing Jesus.

---

<sup>1</sup>It seems likely that ὤπαγε, ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε might have become a liturgical phrase among the early Christians. See Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 226.

<sup>2</sup>For a discussion about the appearance of the proper name in this story, see Haenchen, Der Weg, p. 371.

For him Jesus is the "Son of David" (v.47 and v.48).

Setting aside the historical question, our primary concern at this time is to assess the importance of this title in the plan of Mark's Gospel. This is the first time the "Son of David" appears in the second Gospel (cf. also 12:35-37). Although it is a Jewish Messianic title which is employed far more extensively by the later evangelist Matthew,<sup>1</sup> we cannot too quickly assume that it possessed no meaning for Mark. In view of the fact that apart from the evil spirits (1:24; 3:11; 5:7; cf. 1:34) only Peter confesses that Jesus is the Messiah (8:29) prior to this point in his Gospel, it is quite certain that the second evangelist would have considered the blind man's confession to be quite important. Although Bartimaeus is blind, he obviously "sees" far better than those in the crowd around him. It seems likely also that for Mark the appearance of this title in this story prepares for the following pericope in which Jesus' entry into Jerusalem is described. On that occasion the multitude hails Jesus as the One whose coming is linked with the establishment of the long-awaited

---

<sup>1</sup>For the Old Testament background cf. Is. 11:1ff.; Jer. 23:5f.; Ezek. 34:23f. This title occurs ten times in Matthew, three (or four--cf. Lk. 3:31) times in Luke and nowhere in John.



Davidic Kingdom (cf. 11:9b,10).

At the time of Jesus definite Jewish nationalistic expectations surrounded the "Son of David" title, but it is obvious that since Mark was writing from Rome about 65 A.D. he would not have been sympathetic to such feelings. For Mark Jesus did not come to usher in the eschatological kingdom but to open the way of salvation for all men. It is therefore possible that the second evangelist would have seen a different meaning in Bartimaeus' use of "Son of David" in 10:47,48 since both times he has accompanied this title with the words "have mercy on me!" (ἐλέησόν με). In other words, Mark might have intended the words of Bartimaeus to provide a corrective to the story of the triumphal entry. Jesus is the "Son of David" who in his earthly ministry brings mercy, not victory over political enemies as the crowd in Jerusalem hoped (cf. 11:10).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Fuller, Christology, pp. 188f., concludes that Hellenistic Jewish Christianity reshaped the Davidic Christology, which in the earliest Palestinian tradition was associated almost exclusively with eschatological hopes (cf. pp. 162-164), by applying the "Son of David" title to the earthly life of Jesus. By linking the cry "have mercy upon me" to this title, they were able to use the Davidic Sonship to describe Jesus' miraculous acts of mercy rather than his Messianic rule. (Cf. also Hahn, pp. 262-264,268, on whose work Fuller is largely dependent.) Undoubtedly, Mark would have been aware of this different use of the "Son of David" title since in

Thus far we have observed that the faith of Bartimaeus is demonstrated when he cries out to Jesus and most particularly because his cry includes a Christological title--the "Son of David." Further, it needs to be noted that Bartimaeus' first plea for mercy is answered by the crowd's rebuke (v.48a). This reference to the rebuke by the crowd is sometimes linked with the Messianic secret in Mark,<sup>1</sup> but more often it is understood simply as the crowd's displeasure at the interruption by this blind man of Jesus' and their journey.<sup>2</sup> It seems far more probable, however, that Mark would have intended the rebuke as the first barrier which the blind man's faith must overcome before he meets Jesus.<sup>3</sup> Disregarding the crowd's rebuke, Bartimaeus repeats his cry which this time reaches the ears of Jesus (vv.48b,49a).

---

Rom. 1:3 Jesus' physical descent is already linked to the Davidic Sonship.

<sup>1</sup>Thus, e.g., Gould, p. 204.

<sup>2</sup>Thus Rawlinson, p. 149; Cranfield, p. 345; Grundmann, Markus, p. 222.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Haenchen, Der Weg, p. 372. Having grouped this story with 7:31-37 and 8:22-26, Knox, pp. 59-61, assumes that the interference of the crowd in v.48a is intended to emphasize that the healing is performed by Jesus only after certain difficulty. Knox comes to this conclusion because he has not fully appreciated the major theme of 10:46-52.

The fact that in v.49b the people inform the blind man that Jesus has called him suggests that in v.48a the crowd's response is being used primarily as a foil to Bartimaeus' faith.

When Bartimaeus learns that Jesus has beckoned him, he throws off his garment and jumping to his feet comes before Jesus (v.50).<sup>1</sup> It is then that Jesus asks him the question which provides the blind man with an additional opportunity to reveal his faith that Jesus can help him. In response to Jesus' question, "What do you want me to do for you?", the blind man says, "Master (ῥαββουνί),<sup>2</sup> let me receive my sight" (v.51).

The entire story seems to be narrated from the standpoint of the blind man, and it reaches its climax in Jesus' saying which clearly announces that "faith has saved" the man. Undoubtedly, the early Christians would have seen great significance in the close association

---

<sup>1</sup>It is interesting to note that Matthew, who in this case (Mt. 20:29-34) has not emphasized the Markan theme of faith, has freely omitted both the part of the crowd in v.49 and the vivid description of the blind man's reaction at their news that Jesus wants to see him (v.50).

<sup>2</sup>The use of the form ῥαββουνί as a title for Jesus might imply the highest reverence (cf. Jn. 20:16.). It is perhaps appropriate that both Matthew and Luke substitute the title κύριος for it (cf. Mt. 20:33 and Lk.18:41). Cf. Black, op. cit., p. 21.

of the two words--πίστις and σωζειν.<sup>1</sup> Certainly for them faith issued in salvation in the fullest sense. It is indeed possible that Mark has intended to suggest in the Bartimaeus episode the necessary pattern for all Christian discipleship. The blind man believes; he finds healing (salvation); and he responds by following Jesus on the way. As Lohmeyer has concisely stated it: the blind man is "Neben Jesus, vor Jesus, hinter Jesus . . . "2

All this is not to suggest that Jesus is unimportant to the story since it is he who responds to the "Son of David, have mercy on me" cry and finally speaks the words regarding the man's faith. Nonetheless, there can be little doubt that the principal theme of this story concerns faith and not the power of Jesus. We have already noted that by means of the first story of the healing of the blind man (8:22-26) Mark has introduced the section (8:27-10:45) in which the deeper meaning of Jesus' Messiahship and discipleship are progressively revealed. It is probably not accidental that he has ended this same section with this second story of a healing of a blind

---

<sup>1</sup>For Mark's use of these words, cf. Best, pp. 109f.

<sup>2</sup>Markus, p. 224. Cf. also Grundmann, Markus, p. 223.

man. It links what has gone before with the Passion.<sup>1</sup> Bartimaeus' faith not only brings him to Jesus but also prompts him to follow Jesus on the way (v.52c-- καὶ ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ)--the way which eventually leads Jesus to the Cross.<sup>2</sup>

The Withering of the Fig Tree--  
Mk. 11:12-14,20-25 (Mt. 21:18-22)

The episode of the cursing and withering of the fig tree, the final miracle story in Mark, is narrated in 11:12-14 and 11:20ff. between which the account of the cleansing of the temple has been inserted. Bultmann<sup>3</sup> thinks that the editorial activity of Mark himself has interrupted the connexion between 11:15-19 and 11:27-33 which existed prior to him. It seems certain that the words in 11:28 ἐν κοίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιεῖς refer to Jesus' act of cleansing the temple, not the withering of the fig tree. Elsewhere in Mark one story appears within the framework of another (cf. 3:19b-35; 5:21-43; 6:7-30; 14:1-11 and 14:54-72); this fact lends additional

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Kuby, op. cit., p. 61.

<sup>2</sup>Mark has elsewhere used ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ to refer to the movement of Jesus and his disciples towards Jerusalem (cf. 10:32; 8:27; 9:33f.). Hahn, p. 76, assumes that v.52b is due to Mark's redaction.

<sup>3</sup>History, p. 218.



strength to Bultmann's conclusion that it was the second evangelist himself who has inserted vv.20-25 between vv.15-19 and vv.27-33.<sup>1</sup>

But why has Mark interwoven the episode involving the fig tree and the cleansing of the temple? Although the second evangelist would have presumably interpreted the withering of the fig tree as a miraculous deed accomplished at the word of Jesus,<sup>2</sup> it also appears that he

---

<sup>1</sup>It should be noted that most commentators agree that Mark himself has interlinked the story of the fig tree and the cleansing of the temple. Thus Schmidt, p. 300; Knox, p. 30; Taylor, Mark, p. 460; Best, p. 83; Johnson, Mark, p. 191; and Fuller, Miracles, p. 63.

<sup>2</sup>Taylor, Mark, pp. 458, 460, seems to over-emphasize the witness of this miracle story to the power of Jesus. Lohmeyer, Markus, p. 234, likewise misses the main point of this Markan story when he declares that Jesus curses the tree because he curses that which is not useful to men. Taylor, Mark, p. 465, suggests that Mark himself "on the basis of current tradition" composed vv.20-22. It seems more likely, however, that at least the reference to the withering of the fig tree was part of the pre-Markan story (cf. Schmidt, p. 300) and was accepted by Mark as historically reliable. Most modern interpreters doubt the historicity of this incident and either, on the one hand, suppose that Jesus himself intended the cursing of the fig tree to serve merely as a symbolic parable (Lagrange, Marc, p. 299; Gould, pp. 211f.; Cranfield, pp. 356f.) or, on the other hand, that in this instance a parable (cf. Lk. 13:6-9) has been converted in the early tradition into a miracle story (Bultmann, History, pp. 230f.; Taylor, Mark, p. 459; Johnson, Mark, p. 188; Klostermann, Markus, p. 116). Others specifically assume that a legend has become associated with an actual tree along the road to Jerusalem [E. Schwartz, "Der verfluchte Feigenbaum," Z.N.W., 5 (1904), pp. 80-84; Branscomb, pp. 201f.; Schniewind, Markus, p. 149; cf.

has intended the fig tree episode to have definite symbolic value.

It is indeed quite possible that the story of the withering of the fig tree was already interpreted symbolically prior to Mark's use of it. Certain Old Testament passages which speak of "figs" and "fig tree" could have encouraged such a symbolic interpretation; in fact, in a few instances it is obvious that "figs" and "fig tree" are employed to represent the nation of Israel. Of these Old Testament passages<sup>1</sup> the following three should be especially noted:

When I would gather them, says the Lord,  
there are no grapes on the vine, nor figs on the  
fig tree; even the leaves are withered, . . .  
(Jer. 8:13)

Like grapes in the wilderness, I found  
Israel. Like the first fruit on the fig tree,  
in its first season, I saw your fathers. . . .  
Ephraim is stricken, their root is dried up,  
they shall bear no fruit. Even though they  
bring forth, I will slay their beloved chil-  
dren. (Hos. 9:10,16)

---

also Taylor, Mark, p. 459]. Further H.-W. Bartsch, "Die 'Verfluchung' des Feigenbaums," Z.N.W., 53 (1962), pp. 256-260, accepts vv.13,14a as an original logion in which the suffering, death and Resurrection of Jesus were interpreted as bringing the end-time. Bartsch suggests that this apocalyptic saying only gradually received its present form. Cf. also G. Munderlein, "Die Verfluchung des Feigenbaumes," 10 (1963-64), pp. 92-94.

<sup>1</sup>Cf. also Is. 1:30; Ezek. 17; Joel 1:6f., 11f.; Amos 2:9; and Job 18:16.

Woe is me! For I have become as when the summer fruit has been gathered, as when the vintage has been gleaned: there is no cluster to eat, no first-ripe fig which my soul desires. (Mic. 7:1)

In the first two passages Judah and Israel respectively are likened to fig trees which are barren when the Lord comes for the harvest. The words in Mic. 7:1 are used to depict the moral corruption which has invaded Israel; there is no godliness remaining in Israel--no good fruit which the Lord would desire. The larger context of each of these passages develops the general theme of judgement, i.e., the judgement of God on Israel.

It is sometimes assumed that Mic. 7:1 is the specific Old Testament passage which provides the key for understanding the Markan story.<sup>1</sup> Munderlein, however, seems to be on safer ground when he draws attention to

---

<sup>1</sup>Thus A. de Q. Robin, "The Cursing of the Fig Tree in Mark XI. A Hypothesis," N.T.S., 8 (1961-62), pp. 276-281, and J. N. Birdsall, "The Withering of the Fig-Tree," E.T., 73 (1961-62), p. 191. Munderlein, op. cit., p. 101, however, observes that both Robin and Birdsall do not employ a "formgeschichtliche Untersuchung." For example, Robin is concerned to show "that the statement ὁ γὰρ καρπὸς οὐκ ἦν οὐκὼν represents, not a Markan comment for the benefit of his readers in Rome, but the comment of one of the disciples who witnessed the incident but failed to understand the significance of the quotation from Micah." (Robin, op. cit., p. 280, supposes that Jesus quoted the opening words of Mic. 7 when he saw the fig tree.)

the more general use of the "fig tree" imagery in the Old Testament:

Das vorhandene Material lässt folgende Schlüsse zu: Im dem vom A.T. geprägten Bereich ist es ohne weiteres möglich einen Baum zu einer Symbolfigur zu machen. Ein über ihn gesprochenes Wort oder eine an ihm vollzogene Handlung kann ohne Schwierigkeit in ihrem Symbolcharakter verstanden werden. Als "Adressaten" eines solchen Vergleiches kommen einzelne Menschen, besonders aber die Mächtigen oder die Gottlosen in Frage, aber auch das ganze Volk Israel. Nie wird ein Gegenstand (etwa der Tempel) mit einem Baum verglichen. Die Worte von Bäumen und ihrem Ergehen in diesem Sinn erscheinen vornehmlich in prophetischen Drohworten und Geschichtsdeutungen, sie sprechen vom Handeln Gottes. Die Bilder vom Verdorren der Wurzeln und Blätter sind häufig eingefügt. Sie deuten auf Sinnentleerung des Daseins oder Verwerfung durch Gott hin, während andererseits "das Bild von der Frucht alles, was Menschen sprechen oder tun unter dem definitiven Urteil des Glaubens" sieht.<sup>1</sup>

If in the Old Testament the fig tree is nowhere likened to an inanimate object such as the temple, then it is obvious that Mark has taken a new step by linking the withering of the fig tree with the cleansing of the temple. By this connexion Mark has evidently desired to show what was to befall Israel. The centre of Israel's religious life, the temple, was to be destroyed and with that God's judgement was to come on the unbelieving Jews. In other words, the withering of the fig tree disclosed

---

<sup>1</sup>Op. cit., p. 101.



the final outcome of Jesus' cleansing of the temple.<sup>1</sup>

A number of other passages from 11:1 onwards show the second evangelist's concern with this theme. It is the Jewish leaders who reject Jesus and plot his death (11:18,27ff.; 12:12,13ff.; 14:1f.,10f.,43ff.,53ff.; 15:1,10f.), and, as a result, it is made clear that the promise of God is withdrawn from the Jews and extended to all peoples (11:17; 12:9,12). The temple, to which reference is frequently made in this section, plays an important part in the development of this double theme of judgement (on the Jews) and promise (to all nations).

From 11:27ff. most of Jesus' teaching is done in the temple and it is there that he is confronted by his enemies (11:27ff.; 12:13ff.; cf. also 14:48f.); reference to the destruction of the temple occurs in connexion with the announcement that the gospel must be preached to all nations (13:1ff.); Jesus' statement about the destruction of the temple of his body is misinterpreted by his accusers and is spoken again at the time of Jesus' death (14:58f.; 15:29f.); and finally Jesus' death signifies the opening of God's temple for all peoples (15:37ff.).

By skilfully linking two episodes in 11:12-21 the

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Lightfoot, History, p. 86.



second evangelist has contributed to this double theme of judgement and promise. The death<sup>1</sup> and Resurrection of Jesus were to mean the ending of the old order and the commencement of the order in which the new temple was to be for all peoples (11:17).<sup>2</sup> By attaching the collection of faith-sayings<sup>3</sup> to v.21 Mark has deliberately emphasized the positive side of the double theme; the focus has been shifted from the judgement upon Israel to the promise available through faith.

---

<sup>1</sup>Burkill, pp. 121f., suggests that Mark has linked the withering of the fig tree and the cleansing of the temple not only as an anticipation of the destruction of Israel but also as a pointer to the violent end of Jesus himself: "Jesus condemns the nation to which he belongs, and this very condemnation brings about his own death as well as the ruin of the Jewish people."

<sup>2</sup>It is interesting to observe that the words  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\theta\upsilon\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu$  appear only in the Markan account. The fourth evangelist has further developed the "new temple" theme which is here implicit in Mark. John has specifically linked the saying about the temple of Jesus' body with the account of the cleansing of the temple and has thus suggested that the old temple has been replaced by the body of Jesus, i.e., the Church.

<sup>3</sup>Most commentators assume that the sayings in vv. 23-25 were added by the second evangelist (Taylor, Mark, p. 465; Branscomb, p. 206; Klostermann, Markus, p. 118; cf. also Bultmann, History, p. 25). If, as Mündlerlein (op. cit., p. 102) suggests, these sayings came to Mark as a collected group, it seems probable that Mark has used them because of their contribution to the general theme of faith and not because of the specific content of each saying. Cf. Haenchen, Der Weg, p. 391, who, on the contrary, thinks that Mark has created the whole of vv.20-25.

In conclusion, we can say that Mark has not only used this rather puzzling story of the withering of the fig tree as a demonstration of the power of Jesus but also as a sign pointing both to the destruction of the old order, Israel, and the creation of the new order in which men live by faith in God. Mark has brought out this double theme by inserting the account of the cleansing of the temple within that of the withering of the fig tree. Just as the fig tree was destroyed because it failed to yield fruit,<sup>1</sup> so was the centre of Israel's religious life to be destroyed because the Jews had not produced the proper fruits of faith and love.

#### Summary: Mark's Use of the Miracle Stories

Now that we have considered the miracle stories in Mark, it is necessary to summarize how the second

---

<sup>1</sup>The phrase "for it was not the season for figs" is difficult to interpret. Best, p. 83, suggests that this phrase " . . . indicates a certain unhappiness about its [the story's] present position." C. W. F. Smith, "No Time for Figs," J.B.L., 79 (1960), pp. 315-327, argues that the original incident--like Jesus' entry into Jerusalem--took place during the festival of tabernacles. Munderlein, op. cit., pp. 99, 101, refers to a statement of H. Riesenfeld [Svensk Exeg. Arsbok, 26 (1961), p. 54] in which he suggests that this phrase discloses that the Messiah comes to his people when he is wholly unexpected. Munderlein himself understands it as an indication that Mark has utilized the story because of its symbolic meaning.

evangelist has employed this material, most of which undoubtedly came to him in the tradition. Even an initial reading of the second Gospel discloses that the miracle stories occupy a disproportionately large amount of the book. In all, there are some twenty-one pericopae in Mark (including the summary sections in 1:32-34, 3:7-12 and 6:53-56) which recount miracles performed by Jesus, and of these only the story of the withering of the fig tree (11:12-14, 20f.) appears after chapter 10--i.e., in the Passion narrative. What Mark has emphasized in the initial miracle story used in his Gospel (1:21-28) is characteristic of his entire presentation of the ministry of Jesus: Jesus both speaks and acts with authority.

It has long been recognized that not all the pericopae which report miracles of Jesus can properly be classified as miracle stories.<sup>1</sup> In some instances, a theme other than one relating directly to the miraculous deed of Jesus dominates the story. Indeed, it is possible that in some cases the miracle itself is employed as a confirmation of some word or pronouncement of Jesus. For example, the healing of the paralytic in 2:1-12

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. especially the work of Dibelius and Bultmann.

established the truth of Jesus' claim that the Son of man has authority on earth to forgive sins (2:10) and the cure of the man's withered hand in 3:1-6 demonstrates the reality of Jesus' lordship over the sabbath (cf. 2:28).

In addition to those stories in which the reader's attention is not primarily focused upon the miracle itself, there are certain other Markan pericopae which possess most of the characteristics of a miracle story as well as a more specific theme. It seems likely that Mark has included miracle stories with an eye to the needs of the Church. For example, 9:28f. would have been especially relevant for all those engaged in casting out demons and healing in the Church of Mark's day, and in a more general way Mark's emphasis in the story of the withering of the fig tree on the necessity of faith and prayer (11:22-25) would have presented a constant challenge to the early Christians.

The subject of faith (and its opposite--unbelief) is often mentioned in connexion with the miracles of Jesus (cf. 2:5; 5:34; 5:36; 9:23f.). In at least two cases--the story of Bartimaeus (10:46-52) and that of the Syro-phoenician woman (7:24-30)--this theme almost completely dominates the story. In the latter instance it is obvious

that the faith of the woman has been linked with another important issue in the early Church--the place of the Gentiles in God's Kingdom. The Gentiles share in the bread which was provided for the children (cf. 7:27f.). Undoubtedly, Mark was not the first to make this association just as he would not have been the first to see the feeding narratives as prefigurements of the Church's Eucharist.

In the light of the themes mentioned above, it would appear that Mark has employed some of the miracle story material in much the same manner as he has used the other narrative material about Jesus--to instruct his fellow Christians in various matters which were relevant to the life of the Church. Having observed this fact, we are still faced with a more important question. In Mark's presentation of Jesus' ministry, what part do the miracles play?

It is a common assumption that the miracles are directly related to Jesus' deep compassion for the poverty-stricken condition of man. Although "compassion" might well be an appropriate description of Jesus' actual motivation for healing individuals in his earthly ministry,<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>S. V. McCasland, "Miracles," I.B.D., vol. 3, p. 401, like many interpreters, unquestioningly assumes that Jesus' miracles were done out of his compassion for the needy.



we have seen that this feature is not consistently emphasized in Mark. The second evangelist has explicitly referred to Jesus' compassion in connexion with the miracles in only two or possibly three passages (6:34, 8:2 and also 1:41 if the more difficult reading in D is not accepted), and although the two feeding narratives contain such a reference, it should be observed that in 6:34 Jesus' immediate response to the forlorn appearance of the crowd results not in the miraculous feeding but in teaching.

In addition to these direct references, it must be admitted that quite generally the demeanour of those who approach Jesus seeking help presupposes that Jesus is the one who shows mercy upon the needy. The words of Bartimaeus (10:48f.--*υἱὲ Δαυὶδ Ἰησοῦ, ἐλέησόν με*) and those of the father of the epileptic boy (9:22--*βοήθησον ἡμῖν σκλαυχυντοῖς ἐφ' ἡμᾶς*) give expression to this assumption. This feature, however, is a necessary part of the normal pattern of a story of healing, and it is not something for which Mark has been directly responsible. This leads us to conclude, therefore, that although in Mark certain of Jesus' miracles are associated with his compassion, there is no evidence to support a claim that the second evangelist has sought to develop this theme and apply it

to all the miracles of Jesus. It is indeed possible that the references to Jesus' compassion were part of the tradition which came to Mark.<sup>1</sup>

More serious attempts have been made to interpret the whole of the Markan Gospel and particularly the miracle stories as representing Jesus' struggle against Satan and the members of the demonic world. According to this view, Mark has used both the exorcism narratives and the stories of healings to reveal the various stages in Jesus' victory over Satan (cf. 3:22-27).<sup>2</sup>

It cannot be denied that in the second Gospel great emphasis is laid upon the importance of Jesus' casting out of the evil spirits. Already in 1:21-28, directly after the call of the disciples (1:16-20), Mark has incorporated an exorcism narrative. Again in 1:34 he has stressed Jesus' authority over the demons by describing his casting out of demons as a special function alongside of that of healing (cf. 6:7). Subsequent to the first chapter of Mark exorcism narratives appear in 5:1-20 and

---

<sup>1</sup>Only the reference in 6:34 could have possibly resulted from Mark's redaction, and it may not refer directly to a miracle.

<sup>2</sup>See esp. J. M. Robinson, p. 51 (followed by U. Mauser, *op. cit.*, pp. 130-132, 141-143). Fuller, *Miracles*, p. 70, also seems to espouse this view as does J. C. Fenton, "Destruction and Salvation in the Gospel according to St. Mark," *J.T.S.*, n.s. 3 (1952), pp. 56-58. Cf. above, pp. 8-10.

9:14-29, and it even seems likely that Mark has intended to represent the storm as a demon requiring Jesus' rebuke (4:39). There can be no doubt that he has considered as particularly significant the theme of Jesus' authority over the evil spirits, and he has even stated that this authority was shared with the disciples (6:7,13; cf. also 9:38f.).

Although Mark has emphasized Jesus' authority over the evil spirits by means of the exorcism narratives, apart from 7:24-30<sup>1</sup> he has not explicitly stated that the conditions of the patients in the stories of healing are the result of the work of demons. In fact, it is not at all certain that the second evangelist has intended the exorcism narratives to portray a continuing struggle between Jesus and Satan with the victory coming at the time of the Resurrection. There is the real possibility that Mark has seen Jesus' victory over Satan as taking place already in the Temptation<sup>2</sup> since there is little

---

<sup>1</sup>It seems unlikely that Mark has intended 7:31-37 to be a case of demon possession (δαιμόνις τῆς γλώσσης). Cf. above, p. 84.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. above, pp. 9f., for the differing interpretations of Robinson and Best. Most recently the work of L. E. Keck, "The Introduction to Mark's Gospel," N.T.S., 12 (1966), pp. 361f., seems to support the conclusion that for the Markan Jesus the Temptation involved "testing and victory." He declares, "Mark's Jesus is the

evidence in the Passion narrative to suggest that Mark has viewed Jesus' death as caused by the demonic powers.<sup>1</sup> In addition, there is little reason to suppose that Mark has intended the controversy stories as a further development of the struggle between Jesus and Satan.<sup>2</sup> All in all, the suggestion that Mark has intended his Gospel as a presentation of a cosmic struggle between Jesus and Satan is not entirely acceptable since certain of the miracle stories do not readily fit into this plan.<sup>3</sup> We must look elsewhere for the feature in Mark which underlies his presentation of the miracle stories.

We have observed that both the exorcism narratives and the remaining miracle stories have been related by the second evangelist to the major issue in his Gospel--

---

victorious Son of God who returns from the testing-ground with the εὐαγγέλιον."

<sup>1</sup>Although T. Ling, The Significance of Satan (London, 1961), pp. 12-17, is too intent on finding the demonic in all the Markan stories of healing in the early chapters of Mark (e.g., 1:29-31 and 1:40-45), he rightly calls attention to the absence of references to Satan and demons in chapter ten and following.

<sup>2</sup>This is contrary to Robinson's thesis.

<sup>3</sup>For example, it would appear that the feeding narratives (6:30-44 and 8:1-10) do not lend themselves to this type of interpretation.

the identity of Jesus.<sup>1</sup> It seems likely that in this respect Mark has especially valued the exorcism narratives because therein Jesus' divine nature is acknowledged (cf. 1:24 and 5:7). By including these miracle stories in his Gospel the second evangelist has presented Jesus in his earthly ministry as the Son of God whose divine power is openly and dramatically manifested. Mark has made it clear to his readers from the outset of his Gospel that Jesus is the divine Son; at the Baptism the Spirit descends upon him while the voice from heaven announces his divine Sonship (1:9-11). This fact is reiterated on the occasion of Jesus' Transfiguration (9:7).<sup>2</sup>

Although Mark's readers can recognize who Jesus is,

---

<sup>1</sup>Keck, N.T.S., 12 (1966), pp. 360f., rightly sees that the second evangelist has used both the exorcisms and miracles of Jesus in connexion with that which Jesus teaches and preaches. On p. 360, he says, " . . . in the last analysis, surpassingly strong thaumaturgy is precisely what Mark does not regard as the decisive thing about Jesus, important though it is."

<sup>2</sup>P. Vielhauer, "Erwägungen zur Christologie des Markusevangeliums," Zeit und Geschichte (Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag), ed. E. Dinkler (Tübingen, 1964), pp. 155-169, contends that Mark has presented the Baptism and Transfiguration as the first two stages (the third and final stage occurs at his death when his Sonship is acclaimed by the centurion) in the inthronization of Jesus as the Son of God. Keck, J.B.L., 84 (1965), p. 354, rightly sees that Vielhauer has arrived at this pattern of adoption (Baptism), proclamation (Transfiguration) and acclamation (death) in the light of Egyptian parallels and not the evidence in Mark.



the second evangelist has repeatedly emphasized that the first disciples did not. According to Mark, only the supernatural spirits acknowledge Jesus' Sonship in the early stages of his ministry (3:11f.; 1:24; 5:7; cf. also 1:34b), but they are immediately silenced by Jesus. Both the crowds and the disciples are continually being exposed to the manifestations of Jesus' divine power, and yet there is no indication in Mark that anyone comprehends the significance of these revelations until Peter confesses Jesus to be the Christ (8:29). Even after Peter's confession it is made clear that the disciples continue to misunderstand; it is not now an ignorance of the fact of Jesus' Messiahship but a misunderstanding of the nature of this role.

Accepting this Markan pattern with its pivotal point in 8:27-30, it is necessary to see how Mark has used the specific miracle stories at his disposal. In chapters 1-3 he has included stories which clearly emphasize the divine authority of Jesus--over the evil spirits (1:23-27 and 1:34), over sickness (1:29-31: 1:34a; 1:40-44; 2:11f.), to forgive sins (2:10) and over the sabbath (3:1-5). The crowds express astonishment in the presence of these manifestations of Jesus' power (1:28 and 2:12), and the news of his miraculous deeds (1:28;

1:45a; 3:7f.) encourage more people to flock to him for healing (1:32f.; 1:45b; 3:10). In addition, the first opposition to Jesus is mentioned (2:6f. and 3:2,6). The disciples, however, do not yet play a significant role, and only the evil spirits recognize Jesus to be the "Son of God." They are immediately silenced (1:24f.; 3:11f.; cf. also 1:34b).<sup>1</sup>

Following the section of parables, Mark has incorporated another major block of miracle stories (4:35-5:43). These stories picture Jesus as the Son of God, manifesting his divine power, and Jesus' true nature is recognized by the evil spirits (5:7). Jesus stills the storm (4:35-41), drives the legion of spirits out of the demoniac (5:1-20), heals the woman with the flow of blood (5:25-34) and reclaims the daughter of Jairus from death (5:35-43). The disciples witness these revelations of Jesus' power (only the three leading disciples witness the raising of the girl--5:37), but following the storm they are accused of possessing no faith (4:40f.). Else-

---

<sup>1</sup>Keck, J.B.L., 84 (1965), pp. 341-345, convincingly shows that 3:7-12 is better taken as a conclusion to all which has been recounted up to this point in the Gospel than as an introduction to what follows in 3:13ff.

where the importance of faith is stressed (5:34 and 5:36).<sup>1</sup> Finally, Mark has appended to this group of miracle stories the story of the rejection of Jesus by the people of Nazareth. On this occasion Jesus is unable to work miracles, except a few, because of the unbelief of the people (6:1-6a).

In 6:7-8:26 the second evangelist has concentrated more notably upon the disciples. They obviously do not recognize who Jesus is in spite of the fact that they witness the feedings (6:35-44 and 8:1-9; cf. esp. 6:52 and 8:14-21) and see Jesus walking on the water (6:51). Nonetheless, Jesus continues to be sought by those who desire healings (6:54-56; 7:25f.; 7:32; 8:22), and he successfully cures the sick (6:56; 7:30; 7:35; 8:25). It seems likely that Mark has assigned a definite parabolic meaning to the last miracle story in this section, the healing of the blind man (8:22-26). This pericope is the bridge between what has gone before (6:7-8:21) and the story of Peter's confession which directly follows (8:27-30), and it illustrates that the disciples are to

---

<sup>1</sup>It must be seen that Mark has developed no consistent theme around the subject of faith in 4:35-5:43. M. E. Glasswell, "The Use of Miracles in the Markan Gospel," Miracles, ed. C. F. D. Moule (London, 1965), p. 157, has over-estimated the importance of this theme in this group of miracle stories.

be led by Jesus from their spiritual blindness into sight.

Similarly, the second evangelist has allowed the second story of a healing of a blind man (10:46-52) to form a transition between the previous section in which the disciples are instructed in the true meaning of Jesus' Messiahship (8:31-10:45) and the Passion narrative (11:1ff.). 10:46-52 appropriately highlights the themes of faith and discipleship. In addition to this story, only two other miracle stories are used by Mark in this second half of his Gospel, and both of them are related to the themes of faith and discipleship (9:14-29 and 11:12-14,20-25).<sup>1</sup>

Keck<sup>2</sup> points out that each of these major sections prior to the Caesarea Philippi episode (1:16-3:12; 3:13-6:7a; 6:7b-8:26) is introduced by material about the disciples. In 1:16-20 they are called to follow; in 3:13-19 they are appointed as the Twelve to be "with" him; and in 6:7b-13 they are engaged in those things

---

<sup>1</sup>We have already noted that Mark has symbolically linked the story of the withering of the fig tree with the destruction of the temple.

<sup>2</sup>N.T.S., 12 (1966), pp. 362f. Keck's primary purpose in this article is to show that vv.1-15, taken as the introduction, relates to the whole of the Gospel.

which Jesus did (casting out demons, healing and preaching). All this demonstrates how fundamental to the plan of the second Gospel is the theme of discipleship. Keck concludes,

. . . the "career" of Jesus as Mark tells it not only uses the relation of Jesus to the disciples as structural turning-points within the whole narrative but the narrative itself begins and ends with precisely this note of participating in Jesus' life and death.<sup>1</sup>

The "Messianic secret" of the second Gospel is integrally related to this theme of discipleship as well as to the miracle stories. It is perhaps more accurate to designate it the "secret Sonship"<sup>2</sup> since only in 8:29 is Jesus confessed to be the *χριστός*. 'ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (and ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) is a more important Christological title for Mark. In any case, it has long been recognized that Mark himself has been largely responsible for this secrecy motif.<sup>3</sup> Precisely what meaning Mark has attached to this feature of his Gospel is not so easily determined, and this question has been

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 364.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 368.

<sup>3</sup>W. Wrede, Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien (Göttingen, 1901), did the pioneer work in this area at the beginning of the century.



answered with various suggestions.<sup>1</sup>

Most recently Luz<sup>2</sup> has attempted to clarify the problem surrounding the Markan theme of secrecy by describing it in terms of two different phenomena--a "Wundergeheimnis" and a "Messiasgeheimnis." Following a careful investigation of both the miracle stories and the commands for silence, he concludes that Mark has deliberately shown that the miracles cannot be kept secret but must be openly publicized. Luz finds important evidence to support his conclusion in 1:45<sup>3</sup> and 7:36, where the second evangelist has inserted passages which report that Jesus' command for silence is disobeyed.<sup>4</sup>

Alongside this "Wundergeheimnis" Luz discovers a

---

<sup>1</sup>For a survey of the older literature, see H. J. Ebeling, Das Messiasgeheimnis und die Botschaft des Marcus-Evangelisten ("Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft"; Berlin, 1939). Cf. Keck, J.B.L., 84 (1965), pp. 355f., for a critical summary of the different solutions proposed. Keck, pp. 355-358, addresses himself particularly to the conclusion of Schreiber [thus "Die Christologie des Markus-evangeliums," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, 58 (1961), pp. 154-183] that it is the gnostic myth of the Saviour come to earth current in the Hellenistic world which is the real source of the secrecy motif.

<sup>2</sup>Op. cit., pp. 9-30.

<sup>3</sup>It is not altogether certain that the whole of 1:45 is Markan. Cf. above, p. 24.

<sup>4</sup>Op. cit., pp. 15-17.

"Messiasgeheimnis" which in the Markan plan is more directly connected with the question of Jesus' person. The supernatural spirits recognize who Jesus is and after the Caesarea Philippi episode (8:29) the disciples also do, but by an analysis of 8:27-33<sup>1</sup> Luz attempts to demonstrate that 8:30 ("And he charged them to tell no one about him.") corresponds to 1:34 and 3:11f. In every case, it is the confession of Jesus which is silenced. In other words, although the miracles of Jesus cannot be kept silent, Jesus' Messiahship is.

Although it seems that Luz has too rigidly differentiated between Jesus' identity and his miracles,<sup>2</sup> he is correct in seeing that the secrecy motif in Mark is linked with the Passion. For Mark Jesus' divine Sonship can only be properly understood in the light of the cross; the miracles by themselves do not lead to a recognition of who Jesus is but only result in astonishment. According to Luz, it is Mark's use of the theme of secrecy which has enabled him to keep the

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 20-23.

<sup>2</sup>Commenting upon Luz's paper, E. Schweizer, "Zur Frage des Messiasgeheimnisses bei Markus," Z.N.W., 56 (1965), pp. 8f., suggests that the unity of the "Wundergeheimnis" and the "Messiasgeheimnis" should be more strongly stressed.

miracle story material with the θεῶς ἀνὴρ Christology of the Hellenistic Church and interpret it in the light of the Passion.

So ist die markinische Christologie zu verstehen als ein Versuch, die θεῶς-ἀνὴρ-Christologie und das Epiphaniedenken der hellenistischen Gemeinde nicht etwa zu beseitigen, sondern vom Kreuzeskerygma her verstehbar zu machen, wobei gerade das Beieinander des Wunders, dessen Wirklichkeit nicht verborgen bleiben kann, und des unverständigen Staunens einer ungläubigen Welt angesichts dieses Wunders dem Glauben zum Zeugnis wird.<sup>1</sup>

Although it will be necessary in the final chapter to consider whether it is reasonable to assume, as Luz does, that all the miracle stories are equally the products of a θεῶς ἀνὴρ Christology of the Hellenistic Church,<sup>2</sup> it seems correct to conclude that Mark was faced with the very practical question of how to combine this type of miracle story material and the Passion narrative in the same Gospel. Since certain of the miracle stories openly picture Jesus as the "Son of God," some kind of secrecy motif was necessary.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Luz, op. cit., p. 30.

<sup>2</sup>Keck, J.B.L., 84 (1965), p. 350, emphasizes the need to differentiate between the two streams of miracle material in the Gospel of Mark.

<sup>3</sup>Keck, N.T.S., 12 (1966), p. 368, and Glasswell, op. cit., p. 161, arrive at much the same conclusion. See also Fuller, Christology, pp. 240f., fn. 64.

Mark has reported that Jesus rejects the demand for "signs" which would be self-authenticating (cf. 8:11f.). In a similar manner he has ordered his entire Gospel in order to show that the ministry of Jesus and especially his miracles can only be understood in retrospect from the cross (cf. 15:39), or, in other words, the miracles of Jesus were not self-authenticating but to be rightly understood required faith--faith in the Crucified and Risen One.

## CHAPTER II

### THE MIRACLE STORIES IN MATTHEW

#### The Healing of the Leper--Mt. 8:1-4 (Mk. 1:40-45; Lk. 5:12-16)

In Matthew the story of the healing of the leper comes directly after the Sermon on the Mount and receives a more precise setting than in Mark--the journey from the mountain to the city of Capernaum. The words ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρου in v.1 obviously refer back to 5:1 while the reference to the large crowds who are reported as "following" Jesus<sup>1</sup> must be seen in the light of 4:25 and 7:28. In this way Matthew has closely linked that which follows with the entire preceding section (chapters 5-7).

Bonnard rightly sees that the first evangelist has connected the story of the healing of the leper with the

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew has employed the word ἀκολουθεῖν twenty-five times, frequently in association with the idea of discipleship (cf. 4:20,22; 8:19,22; 9:9; 10:38; 16:24; 19:21,27,28. See also 8:23; 9:27; 20:34; 21:9; 26:58; 27:55). Elsewhere a crowd is described as "following" Jesus and either witnessing healings (8:1,10; 20:29) or having some of their numbers healed (4:25; 12:15; 14:13; 19:2). In 4:25; 8:1; 14:13; 19:2 and 20:29 ἀκολουθεῖν has resulted from Matthew's redaction. Cf. Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 154.



Sermon on the Mount for a theological and not a biographical reason.<sup>1</sup> He states:

. . . celui qui proclame la loi nouvelle  
est aussi celui qui commande à la lèpre (v.3)  
et qui, surtout, accomplit les prescriptions  
légalles à sa manière, face aux autorités  
religieuses d'Israël (fin du v.4).<sup>2</sup>

For Matthew, both the words and deeds of Jesus signify not only a fulfilment of the Mosaic law (cf. 5:17) but also its deficiency. He heals the leper for whom the law was a totally inadequate source of help.

Comparing the Matthean version with that of Mark, we observe that the first evangelist has substituted the words προσελθὼν προσεκύνει<sup>3</sup> αὐτῷ for παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν καὶ γονυπετῶν and, like Luke, has had the leper address Jesus as "Lord" (κύριε). As in 9:18, Matthew has here emphasized

---

<sup>1</sup>In the third Gospel the story of the centurion comes directly after the Lukan version of the Sermon, possibly preserving the original order of the material in Q. If this were so, Matthew's insertion of the story of the healing of the leper is definitely significant.

<sup>2</sup>P. 112.

<sup>3</sup>This word appears thirteen times in Matthew while only two times in the second Gospel and three times in Luke. Jesus is "reverenced" or worshipped" throughout the Matthean Gospel--at his Incarnation (2:2,8,11), during his earthly ministry (8:2; 9:18; 14:33; 15:25; 20:20) and after his Resurrection (28:9,17). In the Temptation narrative it is made clear that true worship is due to God alone (4:9,10). Cf. finally 18:26.

the reverence of the petitioner before Jesus, the one of authority (cf. 7:28). In addition, Matthew has omitted the Markan words describing Jesus' display of emotion (cf. Mk. 1:41,43) and it seems likely that such omissions were likewise intended to present a more exalted picture of Jesus.

Matthew's abbreviation of the descriptive part of the Markan version has tended to highlight the conversational element in this story so that Held is able to conclude that " . . . this miracle story consists of speech and counter-speech: of the request for healing and the word of authority through which the healing takes place."<sup>1</sup> In addition, as Held<sup>2</sup> notes, the more formal pattern of the Matthean version has resulted from the fact that the first evangelist has retained the three-fold use of the word καθαρίζειν. His abbreviation together with the repetition of this word has resulted in the construction of the unusual statement that it was the leprosy, not the leper, which was cleansed ( καὶ εὐθέως ἐκαθαρίσθη αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα ).

Although it is clear that the abbreviation of

---

<sup>1</sup>P. 215.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

Mk. 1:40-43 by Matthew has highlighted the conversation between Jesus and the leper, it must not be assumed that the brief reference to Jesus' touch (v.3-- καὶ ἔτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἥψατο αὐτοῦ. . . ) was unimportant to the first evangelist who exhibits a special interest in the ritual restrictions which are commanded by the law. Nonetheless, Matthew has probably been concerned to include in his Gospel a concise and rhythmic version of the story of the healing of the leper which could be more readily used in the worship and teaching of the Church.<sup>1</sup>

Finally, it must be noted that by eliminating Mk. 1:45 Matthew has ended his version with v.4, Jesus' command to the cleansed leper to go to the priest.<sup>2</sup> Since the following episode in Matthew (8:5-13) takes place in Capernaum, it is obvious that Mk. 1:45 with its reference to Jesus' departure to a wilderness spot

---

<sup>1</sup>Kilpatrick, p. 73, notes 8:1-4 as one example of Matthew's abbreviation of the Markan account, at least in some measure, for liturgical reasons.

<sup>2</sup>Assuming that part or most of Mk. 1:45 has resulted from the redaction of the second evangelist (cf. above, p. 24), it is interesting to note that Matthew's omission of this verse makes the pericope resemble more closely the pre-Markan form in at least this respect. Klostermann, Matthäus, p. 73, rightly notes that in Matthew the reference to Jesus' command for secrecy (ὅρα μηδενὶ εἰπῆς) does not fit with the presence of the crowds in v.1.

would not have been suitable for Matthew's purposes.<sup>1</sup> It is possible, however, that in addition the first evangelist was quite content to have v.4 as the conclusion to the story of the healing of the leper since it emphasizes more forcibly Jesus' compliance with the Mosaic law.

Held<sup>2</sup> rightly concludes that Matthew has not intended v.4 as a demonstration of the healing since he elsewhere ignores Markan verses which are designed for this purpose (cf. Mk. 5:15,29ff.,42b,43b) but as an indication of the Christological significance of Jesus' action.<sup>3</sup> He states,

The fact that Jesus specifically enjoins obedience to the Mosaic law presupposes that he recognises this law. Consequently the healing story of the leper gains by this saying of Jesus a definite Christological sharpening in so far as the Christ who is acting with authority "in contrast to the fanatical view that the law is to be abolished, directly affirms the law and therein sees his own Messianic dignity". In this way there is in Mark already, not a mere miracle story but a kind of paradigm which

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Klostermann, Matthäus, p. 73.

<sup>2</sup>Pp. 255-257.

<sup>3</sup>Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 154, declares, "Das abschliessende Wort Jesu kann das Wunder nicht bestätigen, sondern nur deuten."

ends with a saying of Jesus and expresses the nature of his Messiahship.<sup>1</sup>

Also assuming that v.4 constitutes the actual point of the story for Matthew, Bonnard<sup>2</sup> goes on to assert that, as in chapter 5, Jesus is here portrayed as the Master of the law and that the leper's obedience to the Mosaic regulation would witness not only to his cleansing but also to the authority of Jesus. It is possible that Matthew has intended εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῦ to be directed against the Jewish authorities.<sup>3</sup>

Although, like Mark, Matthew has recounted the healing of the leper, it is obvious that he was primarily interested in this story because of its witness to Jesus' attitude towards the Mosaic law. As we have seen, he has been able to present a concise version which more sharply witnesses to Jesus as the fulfiller and Master of the law by his abbreviation of certain Markan details and by his omission of Mk. 1:45. By placing this story after the Sermon on the Mount he has further underlined this theme.

---

P. 256. Held quotes K. L. Schmidt, "Das Christuszeugnis der synoptischen Evangelien," Jesus Christus im Zeugnis der Heiligen Schrift und der Kirche ("Beiheft zur Ev. Theol., No. 2"; Munich, 1936), p. 21.

<sup>2</sup>Pp. 113f.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 114.



Thus 8:1-4 not only would have suggested to the Matthean congregation that Jesus is the promised Messiah (cf. 11:5) but also would have provided them with an answer regarding the place of the law in the life of the new community.<sup>1</sup>

The Healing of the Centurion's Servant--  
Mt. 8:5-13 (Lk. 7:1-10; cf. also Jn. 4:46-53)

Although not found in Mark this miracle story appears both in Matthew and Luke with possibly an independent version occurring in the fourth Gospel. A careful comparison of the two Synoptic accounts reveals close verbal agreement only between 8:8-10 and Lk. 7:6b-9 since the opening and closing words vary greatly except for the common setting in Capernaum. Although it is almost impossible to determine the sources of the introductory narratives, it seems certain that the conversation between Jesus and the centurion which ends in the striking saying about the unusual faith of the man stands central to the entire passage and itself comes from Q.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. G. Bornkamm, "End-Expectation and Church in Matthew," Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew, trans. P. Scott (London, 1963), pp. 32ff.

<sup>2</sup>It seems unlikely that only 8:8-10/Lk. 7:6b-9 was in Q so that it was necessary for each evangelist to create an introductory narrative. Lohmeyer,

Held<sup>1</sup> rightly concludes that by his redaction Matthew has highlighted the theme of faith which was already central to the pre-Matthean pericope. The evidence of Matthew's work can be seen most clearly in v.13<sup>2</sup>, where he has re-emphasized the theme mentioned first in v.10; in vv.5f. (παράκαλῶν and κύριε), in which he has portrayed the centurion as reverently approaching Jesus; and in vv.11f., where he has inserted a section (cf. Lk. 13:28f.) to interpret the faith of this Gentile in the light of the Kingdom of God and the rejection of the Jews.

If, unlike Held<sup>3</sup> and Lohmeyer,<sup>4</sup> we do not interpret the words of Jesus in v.7 ἐγὼ ἐλθὼν θεραπεύσω αὐτόν as a

---

Matthäus, p. 156, thinks that the variance between the narrative sections of 8:5-13 and Lk. 7:1-10 is due to differing traditions. In addition, Strecker, p. 99, assumes that the opening narrative in Matthew is more original than that in Luke since the third evangelist has characteristically shown interest in the " . . . heilsgeschichtlichen Einheit von Judentum und Christentum." T. H. Robinson, p. 70, on the other hand, concludes that the Matthean narrative is an abbreviation of the Lukan one, emphasizing the faith of the centurion and eliminating the "friendly Jews." It should be noted, however, that the different words for "servant" and "worthy" (παῖς and ἱκανός / δοῦλος and ἄξιος) suggest that Lk. 7:2-6a and Lk. 7:6b-9 were not originally united (cf. Held, p. 194).

<sup>1</sup>Pp. 193-197.      <sup>2</sup>Cf. also 9:22b; 9:29; 15:28.

<sup>3</sup>Pp. 194f.

<sup>4</sup>Matthäus, p. 157. Cf. also Klostermann, Matthäus, p. 74.

question but as a statement, then we have a situation which parallels 8:2, in which Jesus willingly assists the leper in spite of the restrictions of the law. If Matthew has understood these words in this way, it is impossible to view the story of the centurion as a direct parallel to the story of the Canaanite woman in 15:21-28.<sup>1</sup> In other words, in 8:5-13 Jesus' willingness to help even this Gentile comes first and prompts the further expression of the man's faith while in 15:21-28 Jesus' initial hesitance in granting the request of the Gentile woman is overcome by her persistent faith.

If Jesus' statement is correctly interpreted as a promise rather than as a question,<sup>2</sup> then the centurion's reply gives evidence of his faith--particularly of his faith in the word of Jesus. Unlike the Lukan version in which the "elders of the Jews" explicitly request that Jesus come and heal the centurion's servant, in

---

<sup>1</sup>The basic theme involving Jesus' help to a Gentile is the same in both stories although there is a decided difference in the attitude of Jesus. Cf. Schniewind, Matthäus, p. 111, and Bonnard, p. 115.

<sup>2</sup>A number of commentators (Bonnard, Fenton, Lagrange, Schlatter and Schniewind) conclude that Jesus' answer is intended to be a statement. Cf. also S. H. Hooke, "Jesus and the Centurion: Matthew 8, 5-10," E.T., 69 (1957-58), pp. 79f.

the Matthean account it is the centurion himself who comes reverently before Jesus. It is significant that he does not, in fact, request that Jesus come to his house; rather, after describing the distressed condition of his ill servant he waits for Jesus' response. When Jesus immediately agrees to go with him, the centurion is overwhelmed since he did not expect Jesus, a Jew, to enter the house of a Gentile. It is for this reason that the centurion admits that he is unworthy to have Jesus come into his house and that, instead, he is perfectly willing to trust the mere word of Jesus to cure his servant (μόνον εἰπὲ λόγῳ).<sup>1</sup> This he can say since he likewise knows the effectiveness of the word of authority (vv. 8b,9).

La réplique du païen est compréhensible: il sait que Jésus ne peut entrer chez lui et il a entendu parler de l'autorité de la parole (λόγος) du Christ. Il fait donc confiance à Jésus; il sait par expérience que l' "autorité" consiste à vaincre les résistances et à rendre possible l'impossible. L'expérience du soldat rejoint ici l'idée juive de la puissance miraculeuse et créatrice de la "parole."<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>It should be noted that the word μόνον appears only in the Matthean version. Held (p. 195) seems to view these words of the centurion as an afterthought in response to Jesus' question, "Shall I, a Jew, come and heal him?"

<sup>2</sup>Bonnard, p. 115. Hooke, op. cit., p. 80, supposes that the centurion's words in vv.8b,9 indicate that he recognizes that Jesus, like he himself, exercises his

It is obvious that the first evangelist has included vv.11f. as a means for interpreting Jesus' statement regarding the faith of the centurion: "Truly, I say to you, not even in Israel, have I found such faith" (v.10). Drawing attention to the significance of this insertion, Strecker<sup>1</sup> suggests that Matthew has deliberately re-ordered the saying as it is found in Lk. 13:28f. and has substituted the words κατ' οὐδενί for οὐδέ. He assumes that the Lukan οὐδέ is original and that, therefore, Matthew has altered the meaning from that of comparison to that of exclusion. The Gentiles will participate in the Messianic banquet while the "sons of the Kingdom" will be excluded. Undoubtedly, the first evangelist has viewed this rejection of the Jews and the ingathering of the Gentiles as a future event and not one which had already begun in the earthly ministry of Jesus.<sup>2</sup> Although for Matthew the story of the centurion was an exception to

---

power in obedience to a higher authority--that of his Father. This interpretation seems questionable since Hooke must place too much importance on the conjunction καί in the phrase καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος . . . (v.9a) in order to parallel the situation of Jesus with that of the centurion.

<sup>1</sup>Pp. 100f.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Jeremias, Promise to Nations, pp. 55f., who concludes that " . . . the gathering in of the Gentiles occurs in the hour of the final judgement." See further Jeremias, ibid., pp. 62f., for the Old Testament background to v.11.



the general thrust of Jesus' ministry (cf. 10:6 and 15:24), it was certainly understood in the light of the Church's mission (cf. 28:19).

As we have already seen, Matthew has placed the story of the leper (8:1-4) directly after the Sermon on the Mount to demonstrate that Jesus willingly heals one for whom the law provided no help, and now in 8:5-13 Jesus extends his grace to a Gentile who, like the leper, stands outside the Jewish community. While in Luke the centurion's worthiness and loyalty to the Jewish nation is emphasized (cf. Lk. 7:5), Matthew has drawn attention to the Gentile's faith in Jesus' word.

The announcement of the cure itself in v.13b comes as the brief confirmation of the power of Jesus' word in response to the centurion's faith. For Matthew it is clear that this miracle story was important primarily as a means by which he could emphasize the theme of faith, and most particularly faith in the word of Jesus.<sup>1</sup> There can be no doubt that this story would have served to strengthen and deepen the faith of the early Christians in that same "word."

---

<sup>1</sup>The effectiveness of the word of Jesus is also mentioned in the summary passage in Mt. 8:16. Lagrange, Matthieu, p. 166, states, "Il [the centurion] est la figure des gentils qui ont cru à la parole, sans avoir été visités par Jésus."

The Healing of Peter's Mother-in-law--  
Mt. 8:14f. (Mk. 1:29-31; Lk. 4:38f.)

At this point in his Gospel Matthew has used the story of the healing of Peter's mother-in-law to complete this group of miracles which takes place in or near Capernaum. In Mark the story follows the first exorcism narrative (Mk. 1:23-28), but this latter account is omitted in the first Gospel.

By abbreviating Mk. 1:29-31<sup>1</sup> Matthew has made a concise and carefully formed narrative which reminds us of " . . . l'effort pédagogique d'un rabbi chrétien pour imprimer la narration, et sa signification, dans la mémoire communautaire de son Eglise."<sup>2</sup> No longer are the disciples who accompany Jesus in the Markan account mentioned although the house which Jesus enters is still said to be that of Peter.<sup>3</sup> Only Jesus as the central figure (v.14--ὁ Ἰησοῦς) and the ill woman remain in the

---

<sup>1</sup>Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 159, thinks that the differences between the Matthean and Markan narratives can be best explained on the basis of two independent traditions.

<sup>2</sup>Bonnard, p. 116.

<sup>3</sup>It is to be noted that Matthew has substituted Πέτρον for Mark's Σίμωνος. In Matthew the disciple is called "Simon" only in four passages (4:18; 10:2; 16:16f. and 17:25). It seems likely that it was as "Peter" that he was known to the Matthean congregation.

scene. Since the first evangelist has not included the request of the disciples for the sick woman (cf. Mk. 1:30), Jesus is pictured as entering the house and immediately seeing the woman lying helplessly on a bed with a fever.<sup>1</sup> He then touches (cf. 8:3) her hand and her fever leaves.

Unlike the two previous Matthean narratives (8:1-4 and 8:5-13), the element of conversation is totally lacking in this miracle story. Jesus does not speak a word but heals the woman by means of his touch. In addition, Matthew has concluded the story by indicating that the healed woman "served him." By substituting αὐτῷ for αὐτοῖς (Mk. 1:31), he has deliberately emphasized that it is only Jesus whom she serves.

By means of his abbreviation of Mark the first evangelist has focused attention upon the person of Jesus as he comes, sees the need and effects the cure with a touch of his hand. For this reason, Held<sup>2</sup> has listed this miracle story as one in which Matthew has highlighted the Christological theme by his redaction. He concludes that

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew has substituted the word βεβλημένην for Mark's κατέκειτο since he avoids using this word (cf. 9:2; 26:6 and their Markan parallels.

<sup>2</sup>Pp. 169-171.

Jesus is here being portrayed in his healing activity as the fulfiller of the Old Testament expectation, especially as it is stated in Is. 53:4 (cf. 8:16,17).<sup>1</sup> Perhaps it is significant that 8:14f. provides the only instance in the Matthean Gospel where it is Jesus himself who openly takes the initiative by helping a person in need.<sup>2</sup> According to Matthew, Jesus is the One who willingly took the infirmities and bore the diseases of others.

The Healing of Many People--Mt. 8:16f.  
(Mk. 1:32-34; Lk. 4:40f.)

Now we must consider more closely the Matthean summary in 8:16f. As we have already noted, the first evangelist has not only made a number of changes in the Markan account but has also attached the quotation from Is. 53:4, which he has undoubtedly intended as a summary for the whole of 8:1-16.

The following alterations are to be noted: Matthew has omitted Jesus' silencing of the demons (cf. Mk. 1:34); he has probably re-ordered the "sick and demon-possessed"

---

<sup>1</sup>K. Stendahl, The School of St. Matthew (Uppsala, 1954), pp. 106f., concludes that v.17 is Matthew's own rendering of the Hebrew and is not derived from the Septuagint.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Held, p. 169.

( πάντα τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας καὶ τοὺς δαιμονιζομένους ) to read "demon-possessed and the sick" ( δαιμονιζομένους πολλούς . . . πάντα τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας ) in anticipation of the Old Testament quotation which includes the words ἀσθενείας and νόσους; he has eliminated all unnecessary details including that in Mk. 1:33; and finally he has not invested the ending of the sabbath with the same significance as has Mark since for him ὁψίας δὲ γενομένης<sup>1</sup> seems to mean only the closing of " . . . der Tag der ersten Rede und der ersten Heilungen."<sup>2</sup> In other words, by eliminating these details Matthew has structured this section in such a manner as to allow it to become a summary not only for the immediately preceding miracle but also for the entire section beginning at 8:1.

This conclusion is further strengthened when we note the unique phrase καὶ ἐξέβαλεν . . . λόγῳ in 8:16. It is possible that Matthew has intended this to refer back to the significance of his word in 8:1-4 and more particularly to the statement of the centurion in 8:8.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew has omitted ὅτε ἔδυσεν ὁ ἥλιος.

<sup>2</sup>Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 160.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 160: "Wichtiger aber ist das eine Wort, mit dem dieser Bericht die Art der Heilungen Jesu zeichnet: λόγῳ; wieder ist es von grundsätzlicher Bedeutung, denn es veranschaulicht die



If this is so, then Matthew has in this additional manner linked 8:16f. with what goes before, thus making these verses more applicable to the whole of Jesus' healing ministry.

Finally, it should be observed that Matthew has indicated that "many" (πολλοί) were brought to Jesus and he healed "all" (πάντας) while Mark, on the other hand, has reported that "all" (πάντας) the sick and demon-possessed were brought and Jesus healed "many" (πολλούς) and cast out "many" (πολλά) demons.<sup>1</sup> Held draws attention to the significance of the Matthean change at this point when he states,

The purpose of it [πάντας] is less to enlarge the number of miracles than to make a general and doctrinal statement to open up the way for the quotation from the Old Testament. If Jesus heals all who are brought to him, that corresponds to the actual fact in the Synoptic healing stories that everyone who turns to Jesus for healing receives it. Quite clearly--and this would best correspond with the planned layout of Matt. 8:2-17--the summary report speaks less about individual deeds of Jesus at a particular place and time than about his healing activity generally, and the quotation

---

unbezweifelbare Gottesmacht, die in Jesus lebendig ist: Sein Wort ist Geschehen, und Seine Wirklichkeit ist das Wort."

<sup>1</sup>Cf. above, pp. 18f.

from Isa. 53:4 in Matt. 8:17 is intended to interpret all his works of healing.<sup>1</sup>

It should be noted that the first evangelist has similarly employed πάντα in other summary passages (cf. 4:23; 9:35 and 12:15). In each instance "all" the sick are healed by Jesus.

Although Matthew has employed both the story of the healing of the leper and the story of the centurion as vehicles for teaching those in the Church, it would appear that he has understood them together with the story of the healing of Peter's mother-in-law as deeds of healing which reveal Jesus as the Messianic fulfiller. In other words, these miracles of healing when viewed together as one whole aspect of Jesus' ministry are signs of the presence of the Kingdom among men, but in their particular details the evangelist has been able to use them to develop lesser, yet still important, themes for the instruction of the early Christians: Jesus' attitude toward the law (8:1-4), the nature of faith which trusts in the word of Jesus (8:5-13), and the healing assistance which comes at the touch of the Messiah (8:14f., 17).

---

<sup>1</sup>Pp. 171f. Further, Strecker, pp. 66f., points out that Matthew has intended the Is. 53 quotation to be an Old Testament confirmation of Jesus' healing ministry and not a reference to Jesus' death as an expiation for sin.

The Stilling of the Storm--Mt. 8:23-27  
(Mk. 4:35-41; Lk. 8:22-25)

By placing sayings about discipleship (8:19-22; cf. Lk. 9:57-62<sup>1</sup>) directly before the story of the stilling of the tempest (8:23-27), Matthew has disclosed the key to his interpretation of this miracle story. As Bornkamm<sup>2</sup> convincingly demonstrates, the first evangelist has significantly adapted this narrative in order to accent the theme of discipleship which by no means dominates the Markan pericope.<sup>3</sup>

Although this account precedes the story of the Gerasene demoniac in both Matthew and Mark, the first evangelist has placed it after the healing of Peter's mother-in-law (8:14-17). In v.18 Matthew has implied that Jesus' decision to embark for the other side of the lake<sup>4</sup> is a consequence of the crowd's presence (cf. v.16).

---

<sup>1</sup>These sayings occur in Luke just after Jesus has determined that he must go to Jerusalem (cf. Lk. 9:51), and in that setting the theme of radical discipleship seems to be more appropriate.

<sup>2</sup>"The Stilling of the Storm in Matthew," Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew, pp. 52-57.

<sup>3</sup>We assume that Matthew has altered a Markan account which was almost identical to the one which appears in the Second Gospel. Cf. however, Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 163.

<sup>4</sup>The words εἰς τὸ πέραν in v.18 are the only ones derived from Mk. 4:35.

This sets the stage for the requests of the two men who desire to be disciples of Jesus. Before Jesus and his disciples can actually commence their boat journey, a scribe interrupts by announcing his intention to follow Jesus (v.19). After Jesus responds to him, "another of the disciples . . ." asks to be allowed first to bury his father (v.21). Jesus again lays down the conditions of discipleship.

Since vv.19-22 are concerned with the meaning of real discipleship,<sup>1</sup> Matthew has been able to use them as a lead-in for the story of the stilling of the storm. In the light of the occurrence of the word ἀκολουθεῖν in v.19 and v.22 it seems likely that the first evangelist has used it in v.23 as a catchword which carries the meaning of discipleship.<sup>2</sup> In Mk. 4:36 the disciples take Jesus as he is in a boat, but in Matthew Jesus takes the initiative and the disciples "follow" obediently.

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Held, pp. 201-203. Held rightly sees that in the second instance (ἕτερος δὲ τῶν μαθητῶν) Matthew has been concerned " . . . with the repeated demand for a new decision in terms of complete obedience within discipleship." (p. 203). It seems less certain, however, that he is correct in claiming that Matthew has intended Jesus' command in v.18 to go to the other side of the lake as a call to discipleship (p. 202).

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 55. See also Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 164.

Although Matthew has retained the essential outline of the Markan story, he has omitted certain features. He has eliminated λαῖλαψ . . . ἀνέμου (Mk. 4:37) and has substituted σεισμός (v.24);<sup>1</sup> abbreviating Mk. 4:37b he has described the boat as being covered by the waves (καλύπτειν instead of γεμίζειν); he has not mentioned the detail of the cushion (Mk. 4:38a) but has simply reported that Jesus (αὐτὸς δέ) was sleeping; he has retained the reference to Jesus' rebuke of the storm (v.26--ἐπετίμησεν) but has not reproduced the words σιώπα, κεφίμωσο (Mk. 4:39); he has eliminated the words καὶ ἐχόκασεν ὁ ἄνεμος (Mk. 4:39) although he has repeated those which announce the great calm (v.26b--καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη μεγάλη).

Far more significant than the above differences is the way in which Matthew has presented the conversation between Jesus and his disciples. In Mark the disciples first awake Jesus and then, addressing him as διδάσκαλος, they rather impertinently question his concern about their safety (Mk. 4:38). In Matthew, however, the

---

<sup>1</sup>Bornkamm, *op. cit.*, p. 56, draws attention to the fact that this word is normally used to denote an apocalyptic catastrophe (cf. Mk. 13:8; Mt. 24:7; Lk. 21:11; Mt. 27:54; Mt. 28:2; Rev. 6:12, 8:5, 11:13, 11:19, 16:18).



disciples' question is omitted<sup>1</sup> and addressing him as κύριος they cry out, "Save, Lord; we are perishing" ( σῶσον, ἀπολλύμεθα). In addition, Bornkamm<sup>2</sup> (followed by Held<sup>3</sup>) observes that Matthew has inverted the Markan order by placing the words of Jesus before his rebuke of the storm. In the first Gospel the scene runs as follows: the disciples cry out in desperation to their Lord to save them, Jesus then points to their cowardice as a symptom of their "little faith" ( τί δειλοί ἐστε, ὀλιγόπιστοι ), and finally he calms the storm.

What is significant is that in Matthew the disciples are rebuked by Jesus for their insufficient faith while they are yet in peril from the storm. Unlike the Markan account the miracle comes after Jesus addresses them. By replacing the words οὐκ ἔχετε πίστιν with ὀλιγόπιστοι<sup>4</sup> Matthew has undoubtedly intended to apply this story more directly to the situation of the Christians of his day. They have faith, but it is not always sufficiently mature

---

<sup>1</sup>Strecker, p. 121, notes that Matthew has elsewhere eliminated what undoubtedly appeared to him to be disrespectful questions (cf. 14:17 with Mk. 6:37 and 9:18-22 with Mk. 5:31).

<sup>2</sup>Op. cit., pp. 55f.

<sup>3</sup>Pp. 203f.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. 6:30; 14:31; 16:8; 17:20.

in the face of danger.<sup>1</sup>

Bornkamm<sup>2</sup> draws attention to the words οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι in v.27 as another indication that Matthew has sought to widen the application of this episode. He assumes that the first evangelist has intended these words as an allusion to those persons in the Matthean congregation who upon hearing the story join in the response. This is indeed possible since Matthew has elsewhere exhibited a concern to relate the episodes in Jesus' ministry to the situation of the Church (cf. 9:8). For this reason amazement (ἐθαύμασαν) is a more appropriate reaction than fear (cf. Mk. 4:41).

We have thus observed how the first evangelist has successfully emphasized the theme of discipleship in 8:18-27. First of all, by inserting the sayings in vv.19-22 he has shown the conditions for discipleship.

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 56.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 56. Cf. also Lagrange, Matthieu, p. 172. Contrary to Bornkamm, both Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 164, and Schniewind, Matthäus, p. 115, interpret οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἐθαύμασαν in a negative manner. Schniewind understands "the men" as a designation of the disciples who were unreceptive to the manifestation of God's power in Jesus while Lohmeyer assumes that οἱ ἄνθρωποι refers to the unbelieving men of the world. There is no reason to suppose that Matthew has intended the word θαυμάζειν to be strongly associated with the idea of disbelief. (Cf. 9:33; 12:23; 15:31; 21:20. See also 22:22 and 27:14.)

Then, by attaching the story of the stilling of the storm to vv.18-22 by means of the catchword ἀκολουθεῖν (vv.19,22,23) he has provided an example of what it means to follow Jesus. His modification of the Markan account results in a picture of discipleship which would have been appropriate for those in the Church who sought to follow Jesus. The cry of the disciples is now in the form of a prayer (κύριε, σῶσον, ἀπολλύμεθα), and in the midst of the storm the disciples are censured for their little faith and are finally delivered from the danger. All in all, it is obvious that Matthew was far more interested in 8:23-27 as a lesson in discipleship than as a demonstration of Jesus' miraculous power.

The Healing of the Demoniacs--  
Mt. 8:28-34 (Mk. 5:1-20; Lk. 8:26-39)

In reporting the story of the demoniacs directly after that of the stilling of the storm Matthew has preserved the Markan order. His account is shorter than that of Mark, having only seven verses compared to twenty in the second Gospel. By means of this radical abbreviation Matthew has focused the attention of his reader on the person and mission of Jesus more than Mark has. Held concludes that " . . . the wording of this pericope in Matthew's Gospel shows quite clearly that

the marked abbreviations are means of interpretation and they direct attention to the Christological statement [8:29]."<sup>1</sup>

We must now consider the ways in which Matthew has altered the Markan narrative to see whether the first evangelist has, in fact, highlighted the Christological theme of this story. First of all, it is to be noted that the disciples who play an important role in the story of the stilling of the storm<sup>2</sup> are no longer specifically mentioned in 8:28-34. Although in Mark the disciples are not actually referred to again until 5:31, it is to be assumed that they are present during the course of this episode (cf. Mk. 5:1--καὶ ἡθρον). Matthew, however, has made it clear from the start that the disciples are unimportant to the story; only Jesus, the two demons<sup>3</sup> and the populace of the city are included in his version.

---

<sup>1</sup>P. 174.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. above, pp. 163-168.

<sup>3</sup>It should be observed that as in 9:27 and 20:30 Matthew has spoken of two men. Allen, p. 84, and Loisy, Évangiles Synoptiques, vol. 1, pp. 803f., suggest that the first evangelist might have intended to make up for his omission of Mk. 1:23-28 by means of this doubling. It seems rather that this doubling is a result of popular story-telling (cf. Bultmann, History, pp. 314-317; Strecker, p. 39; Haenchen, Der Weg, pp. 195-197).

In addition, it is evident that Matthew was more interested in the demons and their words addressed to Jesus than in the demoniacs themselves and their cure. Mark has reported how the people rush from the city to see Jesus and are frightened when they behold " . . . the demoniac sitting there, clothed and in his right mind, the man who had had the legion" (Mk. 5:15). Undoubtedly, the second evangelist has intended this final description of the man's serenity to stand in direct contrast to that of his former savage state (Mk. 5:3-5). Matthew, on the other hand, has scarcely taken any space to describe the demoniacs' condition prior to the demons being cast out. He has replaced Mk. 5:3-5 with the following words: χαλεκοὶ λίαν, ὥστε μὴ ἰσχύειν τινὰ παρελθεῖν διὰ τῆς ὁδοῦ ἐκείνης . . . (8:28b). In addition, he has not referred to the men after they are cured<sup>1</sup> nor to the desire of the healed demoniacs to follow Jesus (cf. Mk. 5:18-20). Instead he has merely described the excited flight of the herdsmen into the city and the return of the people begging Jesus to depart from their territory (vv.33f.).

By this consistent abbreviation Matthew has been

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 166, and Held, p. 172.



able to bring his reader straightway to the words of the demons (v.29--τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ; ἦλθες ὥδε πρὸ καιροῦ βασανίσαι ἡμᾶς). Undoubtedly, the first evangelist has considered these words to be an important testimony to the person of Jesus, and his own peculiar interpretation of them is disclosed in the alterations which he has made in the Markan account.

Held correctly points out that Matthew has not interpreted v.29 primarily as the demons' words of defense to ward off the threat to them present in Jesus since the actual words of adjuration occurring in Mk. 1:24 (οἶδά σε τίς εἶ) and Mk. 5:7 (ὀρχίζω σε τὸν θεόν) have been omitted.<sup>1</sup> Instead, Matthew has inserted words which carry definite Christological significance (ἦλθες ὥδε καιροῦ βασανίσαι ἡμᾶς). Held concludes,

When Matthew passes them [the words of adjuration] entirely by and only uses the statement about the "coming", i.e. the mission of Jesus, it is clear that he does not wish to depict the demons as trying to exercise counter-magic, but he is putting a Christological statement into their mouths. Jesus has come to deliver the demons to the judgment of torment before the "time", before the final irruption of the rule of God.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. above, p. 9.

<sup>2</sup>Pp. 173f. Held, pp. 268-270, argues that the words πρὸ καιροῦ reveal that the Matthean eschatology differs from that of Mark. For Mark Jesus' authority over the demons indicates that the Kingdom of God has

In the remainder of the narrative Matthew has portrayed Jesus as the One who demonstrates his mastery over the demons and alone determines their fate. He has omitted the conversation which takes place between Jesus and the demon in which the name "Legion" is mentioned (cf. Mk. 5:9), but from that point onward he has followed Mark by reporting that the demons anticipate their expulsion and, as a result, beg Jesus to allow them to enter a herd of swine which is feeding some distance away. Jesus permits this by speaking just one word (v.32-- ἰκέετε). Finally, by adding the words καὶ ἠπείθωνον ἐν τοῖς ὕδατιν in v.32 Matthew has reported the destruction of the demons more impressively than Mark.<sup>1</sup> It is clear that they die in the water.

It is worth noting that it is Jesus, whom the whole city comes out to meet (v.34); the healed demoniacs are not even mentioned. The townspeople come to Jesus with fear and reservation (v.34), like the demoniacs in v.28,

---

arrived (cf. Mk. 1:14), but for Matthew the Kingdom still lies, at least in part, in the future. Held (p. 269) declares: "But then χρόνῳ καί ποῦ means the same as 'in the time of the Church'. According to this Matthew sees in the exorcism of the demons of Gadara the evidence of the authority of Jesus, now already, before the end, in the time of the Church, to deliver up the demons to their eschatological judgment." Cf. further Strecker, pp. 88,176, and Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 166.

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 166.

and beg him to depart from their area.<sup>1</sup> Matthew has probably assumed that this story takes place in Gentile territory,<sup>2</sup> and his mentioning the people's rejection of Jesus, on the one hand, provides a striking contrast to the faith of the centurion (8:5-13) while, on the other hand, anticipates a similar rejection among Jesus' own people.

As we have seen, Matthew has omitted what for him were non-essential details of the Markan account. This has had the effect of concentrating the reader's attention upon Jesus and his encounter with the demons. V.29 holds the key for Matthew's interpretation of this encounter--Jesus is clearly "the Son of God"<sup>3</sup> whose presence means the destruction of the demons prior to the day of judgement. In the final verses he has retained only the reference to the people's negative reaction to Jesus, not that to the healed demoniac. All in all, Matthew has emphasized the Christological significance of this pericope.

---

<sup>1</sup>Lagrange, Matthieu, p. 176, declares, "C'est seulement la vue de Jésus qui décide les gens à lui demander de s'en aller."

<sup>2</sup>Matthew has retained the reference to the herd of swine.

<sup>3</sup>It should be noted that the first evangelist has omitted the words 'Ἰησοῦ . . . τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, bringing this passage into agreement with the form of this title elsewhere in the Gospel.

The Healing of the Paralytic--  
Mt. 9:1-8 (Mk. 2:1-12; Lk. 5:17-26)

In Mark this pericope comes after the story of the healing of the leper and takes place "in a house" (Mk. 2:1) in Capernaum, but in Matthew it evidently happens while Jesus is returning to "his own city" from the Gadarene territory.<sup>1</sup> The imperfect tense of the verb in 9:2 (προσέφερον) leaves the impression that the paralytic is brought to Jesus as he disembarks from the boat and enters the city.<sup>2</sup>

Matthew has effectively consolidated the Markan account, and in so doing he has concentrated upon the theme of forgiveness rather than the healing itself. In the first place, he has completely omitted the verses describing the extensive efforts of the men who brought the paralytic to Jesus (see Mk. 2:3b,4)<sup>3</sup> and, as Held<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 168, who thinks that the Matthean setting fits the internal characteristics of the pericope far better than does the Markan; his argument, however, is not too convincing since all the details can be explained just as well if the Markan setting is accepted as original.

<sup>2</sup>J. Dupont, "Le paralytique pardonné (Mt. 9:1-8)," Nouvelle Revue Theologique, 82 (1960), pp. 940f., assumes that Matthew has intended Jesus to be somewhere in Capernaum and possibly even within a house when the paralytic is brought to him.

<sup>3</sup>Matthew has perhaps eliminated v.4 since in his Gospel the incident does not take place in a house.

<sup>4</sup>p. 175. Cf. further Dupont, op. cit., pp. 941f.

points out, this eliminates the basis for the statement regarding the men's faith, a passage retained by Matthew (v.2). Although the activity of the bearers must be assumed in Matthew (v.2--προσέφερον), it is obvious that the first evangelist was not really interested in these men and their faith.

Secondly, because of his pruning of Mk. 2:6-8 (9:3f.) both the charge of blasphemy from the scribes and Jesus' immediate discernment of their maliciousness are reported in rapid succession. In the process Matthew has omitted both Mark's explanation that it is only God who is able to forgive sins (Mk. 2:7)<sup>1</sup> and the more detailed description of the fact that Jesus knew their evil thoughts (cf. Mk. 2:8--καὶ εὐθύς . . . τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ). By paralleling the opening words in v.2 (καὶ ἰδὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς) and v.4 (καὶ εἰδὼς ὁ Ἰησοῦς) Matthew has not only improved the style of the story but has also suggested that Jesus perceives the thoughts of his opponents just as readily as he recognized the faith of the paralytic and his friends. It should be further noted

---

<sup>1</sup>Unlike Mark, Matthew has probably assumed that his readers (Jewish-Christians) were acquainted with the reasons for a charge of blasphemy.



that by inserting the word  $\kappa\omicron\nu\nu\eta\rho\acute{\alpha}$ <sup>1</sup> in v.4 Matthew has pictured Jesus as clearly discerning the intention of the scribes' charge; " . . . die Jesus L sterung vorwerfen, sind selbst die Argen."<sup>2</sup>

Matthew's major abridgement of Mk. 2:3-8 has brought his readers more quickly to the verses in this pericope which were undoubtedly the most important for him. In vv.5f. Matthew has reproduced almost identically the Markan verses concerning the Son of man's authority to forgive sins.

In the third place, it should be noted that Matthew has linked the concluding verse with the theme of v.6 by means of the word  $\acute{\epsilon}\chiουσία$ .<sup>3</sup> Other alterations of Mk. 2:12 made by the first evangelist have tended to adapt the conclusion more obviously to the doctrinal theme of the story; the healing itself does not receive the major emphasis. For example, the words  $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\piροσθεν πάντων$  which

---

<sup>1</sup> $\kappa\omicron\nu\nu\eta\rho\acute{\alpha}$  is a favourite word of Matthew. It appears two times in Mark, eight times in Q, eleven times in Luke and twenty-four times in Matthew (thus Kilpatrick, p. 21).

<sup>2</sup>Lohmeyer, Matth us, p. 168.

<sup>3</sup>The word  $\acute{\epsilon}\chiουσία$  appears in Matthew in a number of passages which have been taken over from Mark (cf. 7:29; 9:6; 10:1; 21:23,24,27), but, in addition, it occurs in three other places--in the story of the centurion (8:9), in 9:8 due to Matthew's redaction, and finally in 28:18. Cf. Foerster, T.W.N.T., vol. 2, pp. 563-571.

in Mk. 2:12 suggest that all could watch the healed paralytic arise and carry out his pallet are omitted by the first evangelist (cf. v.7). In addition, Matthew has deleted the final words in Mark, λέγοντας ὅτι οὕτως οὐδέποτε εἶδαμεν, in which the stress is upon what they had seen and has somewhat conventionally introduced his concluding verse with the participle ἰδόντες: "Having seen, the crowd was overcome with fear and glorified God for giving such authority to men."<sup>1</sup> By substituting the word ἐφοβήθησαν for Mark's ἐξίστασθαι, Matthew has made the conclusion more applicable to the theme of authority. Fear, not amazement, is the appropriate reaction in the presence of One who not only has the power to heal but also the authority to forgive sins.

Finally, it is important to note the words τοῖς ἀνθρώποις included by Matthew in v.8. Held, following Schlatter,<sup>2</sup> concludes that by these words the first evangelist has intended to include both Jesus and the early Church since " . . . wherever possible the evangelist imports the situation of the Christian congregation into

---

<sup>1</sup>This is our own rendering of the Greek.

<sup>2</sup>P. 301.

the account of the earthly Jesus."<sup>1</sup> Already in 8:27 Matthew has exhibited this tendency to incorporate his readers into the narrative, and if this were his intention in 9:8, then he must have had a reason for doing so.

It seems certain that by means of these words in v.8 Matthew has sought to link the Church's commissioned right of absolution (cf. 16:19 and 18:18) with the

---

<sup>1</sup>p. 273. Thus also Strecker, pp. 220-226; Haenchen, Der Weg, p. 104; and B. W. Bacon, Studies in Matthew (London, 1930), pp. 189f. Cf. further W. Schenk, "'Den Menschen' Mt. 9:8," Z.N.W., 54 (1963), pp. 272-275, who, contrary to Schlatter and Held, argues that τοῖς ἀνθρώποις should be interpreted as a dative of advantage since Matthew has used this form freely and there are no examples of a dative which means "to give" to someone. In addition, he says: "ἀνθρώποι ist bei Mt. absolut kein besonderer Begriff, der die Jüngerschaft charakterisiert, sondern im Gegenteil der Welt, die die Jüngerschaft verfolgt" (p. 274). All this leads Schenk to conclude that the τοῖς ἀνθρώποις in v.8 should be translated "on behalf of" or "for the sake of" men and that v.8 is, in fact, not referring to the Matthean congregation but is a prelude to Matthew's universalism in 28:18f.--the gospel is for all men. Although Schenk's argument is formidable, he has not noted the occurrence of οἱ ἄνθρωποι in 8:27. There these words must certainly be an allusion to the members of the early congregation since only the disciples of Jesus take part in the story. If Matthew can use ἀνθρώποι in that instance as an indirect designation of Christian disciples, there is at least the possibility that τοῖς ἀνθρώποις in 9:8 is a similar reference. Schenk's hypothesis is by no means new since P. W. Schmiedel (Protestantische Monatshefte, 1898, II, p. 299) already argued for interpreting these words as a dative of advantage some sixty to seventy years ago as Dupont, op. cit., p. 950, points out.

authority implicit in the earthly ministry of Jesus.<sup>1</sup> Matthew knew that the authority to forgive sins was shared by those in the Christian community. In Mark the authority to forgive sins is exclusively connected with the person and mission of Jesus, but in Matthew a wider dimension is shown since it is applied to the Christian congregation.<sup>2</sup>

In our discussion above we have seen that Matthew, more than Mark, has tailored the story of the healing of the paralytic to draw attention to the doctrinal issue regarding the authority to forgive sins. The healing itself is reported quite briefly in v.7 and stands only as the confirmation of this authority

---

<sup>1</sup>Strecker, p. 221, finds further evidence in the Matthean redaction of the account of the institution of the Lord's Supper for the correctness of this interpretation of v.8. Matthew has inserted the words εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁματιῶν in 26:28 as an indication that the congregation has at its disposal the authority of the Lord to forgive sins.

<sup>2</sup>Dupont, *op. cit.*, p. 958, comes to much the same conclusion when he states, "Ces explications permettent de donner toute sa signification au verset qui conclut l'épisode du paralytique. Jésus a accompli un miracle pour prouver qu'étant le Fils de l'homme, il a le pouvoir de remettre les péchés. Matthieu sait que Jésus a communiqué ses pouvoirs et qu'ils restent présents dans l'Eglise; cette pensée lui est particulièrement chère. En invitant ses lecteurs à craindre Dieu et à lui rendre gloire pour le pouvoir qu'il a donné à Jésus, il veut aussi qu'ils le remercient d'avoir fait que ce pouvoir reste en la possession de hommes et continue à s'exercer dans l'Eglise, par les apôtres et leurs successeurs."

possessed by the Son of man. Particularly noteworthy is the manner in which Matthew has drawn out the ecclesiological significance of this subject (v.8).

The Ruler's Daughter and the Woman with  
the Issue of Blood--Mt. 9:18-26  
(Mk. 5:21-43; Lk. 8:40-56)

As in 8:28-34, Matthew has here eliminated many of the Markan details so that both stories are swiftly brought to their conclusions.<sup>1</sup> In neither case, however, has Matthew's radical abridgement damaged the basic thrust of the story; in fact, it has served to highlight their witness both to the person of Jesus--he not only heals the sick but even raises the dead--and to the nature of saving faith.<sup>2</sup>

Rather than placing this pericope directly after that of the demoniac as in Mk. 5:1-43, Matthew has used

---

<sup>1</sup>Kilpatrick, p. 73, calculates that 9:18-26 is just thirty-six per cent of the length of the corresponding Markan account.

<sup>2</sup>Held, pp. 167f., states: "It would be extremely difficult, in view of the far-reaching abbreviation of the narrative of the casting out of demons in Gadara (Matt. 8:28-34), for example, and of the story of the raising of Jairus' daughter (Matt. 9:18-26), to speak of the carelessness of popular journalism. . . . It looks very much more as though the abbreviating is done in the interest of concentration on what is essential and must consequently be regarded as a means of interpretation."



it as the first of three narratives (9:18-34) which follow the controversy stories in 9:1-17. It seems likely that Matthew has intended the arrival of the disciples of John in 9:14 to take place while Jesus is still dining with the tax collectors since in 9:19 it is reported that Jesus must arise before he can follow the ruler (καὶ ἐγερθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς . . . ). Thus, in place of the description of the crowd which gathers around Jesus near the sea (Mk. 5:21), the first evangelist has indicated that the ruler, entering the house where Jesus and his disciples are eating with the tax collectors and to which the disciples of John have come, interrupts their conversation (v.18--ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος αὐτοῖς).<sup>1</sup>

We must now note how Matthew's alterations of these Markan stories highlight the theme of faith. First of all, it should be observed that Matthew has replaced the longer form of entreaty in Mk. 5:22b,23a by a favourite

---

<sup>1</sup>On the basis of these transitional words, Bonnard, p. 135, suggests that Matthew has also possibly intended a connexion between 9:18ff. and the preceding verse (v.17) which is concerned with the theme of the "new wine" since with the healing of the sick and the raising of the dead the newness of the Kingdom is inaugurated and fasting is no longer necessary. It should be noted that Matthew has inserted a similar transitional phrase in 12:46 and 17:5.

word προσκυνεῖν.<sup>1</sup> Perhaps, for Matthew this act of reverence is doubly significant since, as we have seen, it occurs in the presence of the tax collectors and sinners. For this ruler of the synagogue,<sup>2</sup> a representative of the established order in Judaism, to do obeisance before Jesus in the presence of the outcasts from the Jewish religious community would be a sign of his daring faith.<sup>3</sup>

Further, Matthew has emphasized the nature of the ruler's faith by means of the words, "My daughter has just died; but come and lay your hand on her, and she will live." In Mark Jairus describes the condition of the girl by saying, "My little daughter is at the point of death" (v.23-- ἐσχάτως ἔχει), and it is not until they are on the way to his house that the messengers inform them that the girl is dead. In Matthew, however, it is made clear at the very outset that the girl is already

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. above, p. 146.

<sup>2</sup>It should be noted in passing that Matthew has neither identified the ruler by name as in Luke (and possibly Mark) nor explicitly described him as a ruler of the synagogue. It is possible that the name "Jairus" was not included in his version of Mark, but it seems more plausible that the first evangelist has deliberately omitted it since he has shown an interest in the general theme of faith and not the details of the story.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Lohmeyer, Matthäus, pp. 176f.

dead. Not only do the words ἄρτι ἐτελεύτησεν indicate that the girl has just died, but also ἀλλά and the future tense ζήσεται confirm this. Although it is possible that Matthew has changed v.18 in order to portray Jesus from the beginning of the story as the restorer of the dead, it seems more likely that he was seeking to highlight the quality of the ruler's faith.<sup>1</sup> The father believes that Jesus can accomplish what is seemingly impossible.

In 9:18f., 23-26 the action almost completely centres around Jesus and the ruler since none of the disciples, who are incidentally mentioned in v.19, reappears later in the narrative when Jesus arrives at the ruler's house.<sup>2</sup> Matthew has not specifically mentioned the mother of the girl (cf. Mk. 5:40). In addition, he has omitted the Markan references to the witnesses' reaction

---

<sup>1</sup>Schmidt, p. 149, argues that Matthew is here concerned to report in a convincing manner this raising of the dead as a preparation for 11:5 (cf. also Haenchen, Der Weg, p. 209). Held, p. 180 (following Klostermann, Matthäus, pp. 82f., and Bacon, Studies in Matthew, p. 193), however, supposes that Matthew has altered v.18 to emphasize the theme of faith. It is, of course, possible that the first evangelist had both of these possibilities in mind.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Mk. 5:37, where it is stated that Peter, James and John accompany Jesus into the house of the ruler of the synagogue.

of amazement and Jesus' command for silence; instead, " . . . the report of this went through all that district" (v.26). Finally, it is to be noted that the words *ταλιθα κουμ*. (Mk. 5:41) are not retained and the healing itself is briefly reported with words which are probably patterned after the words of the ruler's request (cf. v.25-- . . . *εἰσελθὼν ἐκράτησεν τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς, καὶ ἤγέρθη τὸ κοράσιον* with v.18-- *ἀλλὰ ἐλθὼν ἐπίθες τὴν χεῖρά σου ἐπ' αὐτήν, καὶ ζήσεται* ). In this way, Matthew has made it absolutely clear that the request of the ruler finds its answer in the deed of Jesus. Held draws attention to the significance of this when he says,

The few details which Matthew provides in his presentation serve more or less to prove how Jesus fulfils the request of faith: he comes, touches the dead child, and she stands up alive again (cf. Matt. 9:18 with Matt. 9:23-25). Thus in this instance, too, we see not really a miracle story but a teaching narrative about faith.<sup>1</sup>

Without a doubt the theme of saving faith is also central to the story of the woman with the issue of blood as the concluding statement in v.22 demonstrates. Although the presence of the crowd must be supposed in

---

<sup>1</sup>p. 180.

view of the words in v.20, " . . . a woman<sup>1</sup> . . . came up behind (ἐπισθεν) him and touched the fringe of his garment . . .",<sup>2</sup> it is apparent that it no longer plays a prominent part in the Matthean story (cf. Mk. 5:24). In a similar fashion Matthew has omitted the reference to the disciples, who in Mk. 5:31 respond to Jesus' inquiry regarding who touched him, and allows the entire scene to be dominated by Jesus and the woman.

Like Mark, Matthew has indicated that the woman believes that she will be made whole (σωθήσομαι) if only (μόνον) she touches the fringe of Jesus' garment, but he has not reported directly the instantaneous cure which comes to her (cf. Mk. 5:29a); instead he has postponed the announcement of the cure until Jesus speaks the assuring words regarding the faith of the woman (v.22).<sup>3</sup> By omitting the whole of Mk. 5:29-33 Matthew has avoided drawing attention to Jesus' awareness of the departure of power from his body as well as his concern over who in the crowd has touched his garment.

---

<sup>1</sup>It should be noted that Matthew has greatly abridged Mark's description of the woman's condition. Cf. 9:20 with Mk. 5:25f.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Held, p. 179.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Lagrange, Matthieu, p. 186.



Undoubtedly, θάρσει<sup>1</sup> θύγατερ, ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε (v.22) have become for Matthew the key words around which the remainder of the story is fashioned.<sup>2</sup> As we have seen, in his radical abbreviation of the Markan account Matthew has retained only the details of the narrative which give evidence of the woman's faith (9:20b and 9:21), and then he has used v.22 as a witness to the faith of the woman and as an announcement of the healing. To the words ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε Matthew has added καὶ ἐσώθη ἡ γυνὴ ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης, thus connecting the healing of the woman with her faith. In the light of this final phrase, it is possible, as Bonnard<sup>3</sup> suggests, that Matthew has intended the healing to be effected by the word of Jesus and not at the moment of the woman's contact with the fringe<sup>4</sup> of his garment. In any case, it is probable that the first evangelist

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. 9:2 and 14:27, where this word is used. Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 177, states, "Sei getrost, verstärkt und erhöht zu einem Worte göttlicher Offenbarung."

<sup>2</sup>Held, p. 179, declares: "... the healing of the woman with the haemorrhage is made by Matthew entirely ancillary to the saying of Jesus which this story contains: ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε."

<sup>3</sup>P. 136.

<sup>4</sup>It should be noted that Matthew agrees with Luke over against Mark by including the words τοῦ χρασκέδου.

has deliberately repeated the word σωζειν, implying a double meaning--that of spiritual and physical salvation.<sup>1</sup>

While highlighting the theme of faith in these two stories, the first evangelist has at the same time presented a more exalted picture of Jesus than that in Mark. For example, when Jesus is touched by the woman, he immediately knows who has done it and turns to her. He does not need to inquire as in Mk. 5:30. Perhaps, by eliminating this question of Jesus Matthew has also wished to avoid the inference that Jesus might be ignorant of something which was happening.<sup>2</sup>

As we have seen, Matthew's abridgement of Mk. 5:21-43 has not only resulted in a far more concise and stylistically uniform narrative but also has highlighted the essentials of the two stories. It is obvious that the first evangelist has particularly wanted to stress the theme of faith, and, therefore, he has knitted

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. further 8:25 and 14:30, where Matthew has introduced σωζειν with a similar double meaning.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Strecker, p. 121. 8:29; 14:17; 16:9f.; 17:11,14,17; 18:1 and 19:7 are other examples of Matthew's omission of questions asked by Jesus. Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 177, assuming that the crowd is no longer present, declares, "Er [Jesus] braucht nicht zu fragen, wer Ihn berührt habe, denn allein die Frau ist vor Ihm wie in demütiger Beugung."

the two stories more closely together. For Matthew, Jesus is the Messianic fulfiller who when responding to faith can overcome even the finality of death.

The Healing of the Two Blind Men--  
Mt. 9:27-31 (cf. Mt. 20:29-34;  
Mk. 10:46-52; Lk. 18:35-43)

As in 9:18-26, the theme of faith is central to 9:27-31 as both the question of Jesus in v.28 and his words of assurance in v.29 demonstrate. The conversation between the two blind men and Jesus dominates this brief pericope and discloses the nature of persistent faith. The men address Jesus as "the Son of David" and ask for mercy (v.27b). At first Jesus apparently ignores them, but after they have entered a house he responds to their cry with his question and heals them in accordance with their request. As is the case elsewhere (cf. 20:34 and Mk. 8:23,25), the healing is accomplished by means of the touch of Jesus (v.29), but this action is not meant to detract from the central theme of faith. It has been rightly seen that the first evangelist has here acted " . . . not indeed as a narrator but as a teacher who gives instruction about faith."<sup>1</sup>

Although 9:27-31 has no direct parallel in Mark,

---

<sup>1</sup>Held, p. 225.

certain commentators<sup>1</sup> suppose that it must be related, at least in some degree, to the other story of the healing of blind men in 20:29-34, which is dependent upon the healing of blind Bartimaeus in Mk. 10:46-52. Held,<sup>2</sup> in particular, argues that Matthew has reported this healing story twice--in 20:29-34 as a direct rendering of Mk. 10:46-52 and in 9:27-31 as a freely-edited version of 20:29-34. If Held is correct, it is in 9:27-31 that the editorial hand of Matthew should be most clearly detected.

Held assumes that 9:27-31 is a fresh reworking of 20:29-34 since in the latter story the first evangelist has not preserved the statement about faith from Mk. 10:52: ὕπαγε, ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε. As further support of his conclusion Held notes the following features: (a) in both cases two blind men are healed (cf. Mk. 10:46-52 and Lk. 18:35-43); (b) in each situation Jesus heals the men only after he has touched their eyes; (c) in both stories the healing takes place only after the blind men have made a renewed request to Jesus;<sup>3</sup> (d) ἀπαγαγεῖν (9:27;

---

<sup>1</sup>Thus Bonnard, Fenton, Held, Klostermann, McNeile, Schlatter and Schniewind. Cf. Bultmann, History, p. 212.

<sup>2</sup>Pp. 219-225. Cf. further Fuller, Miracles, p. 25.

<sup>3</sup>It should be noted that Held interprets the words ἐλθόντι δὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν (v.28) in this manner.

20:30), ἀκολουθεῖν (9:27; 20:29) and ἄπτεσθαι (9:29; 20:34) suggest that the same vocabulary is being employed; (e) when 9:27f. is compared with the opening sentence in the stilling of the storm (cf. 8:23), there is evidence of Matthew's own literary style; and finally (f) the characteristic manner in which Matthew has formed the statement about faith is noticeable.

Held's conclusion regarding the composition of 9:27-31 is not so convincing, however, when it is observed that certain of the above similarities can be accounted for in other ways. For example, we have already noted that the first evangelist has elsewhere doubled the number of persons involved in the story (8:28); this fact, therefore, does not necessarily indicate that 9:27-31 is derived from 20:29-34.<sup>1</sup> In addition, it would appear that ἀκολουθεῖν and ἄπτεσθαι are the words which Matthew would have naturally chosen to describe these actions. Matthew has employed both words frequently (ἀκολουθεῖν appears twenty-five times while ἄπτεσθαι occurs in 8:3; 8:15; 9:20; 9:21; 9:29; 14:36; 17:7 and 20:34).<sup>2</sup> Further, we must ask,

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. above, p. 169.

<sup>2</sup>τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιθεῖν is another expression which is used in 19:13, but it does not seem appropriate to describe a delicate touch to the area of the eyes.



how much importance should be attached to the order given to the cry for mercy and "the Son of David" title? Why has Matthew not included κύριος in their cry in 9:27 as he has in 20:30,31?

Finally, it must be noted that Held has essentially passed over the difficulties which are raised by v.28a and v.30b. If Matthew were totally free to construct this narrative as he wished, why would he ever refer to "a house" or include the strongly prohibitive command of Jesus since he has elsewhere avoided these features of the Markan Gospel. In 8:1-4 he has eliminated ἐμψύμας (Mk. 1:43) even though he has retained Jesus' command ὅρα μηδενὶ εἰπεῖς, and later in the story of the Canaanite woman he has omitted the reference to Jesus' entry into a house for the sake of secrecy (cf. 15:21ff. with Mk. 7:24). All other passages in Matthew which describe Jesus as issuing commands for silence have Markan parallels.<sup>1</sup> There appears, therefore, to be no evidence which suggests that Matthew would have been inclined to insert such a prohibition in 9:27-31. If then, in fact, this pericope has resulted entirely from his editorial work, the words καὶ ἐνεβρίμην αὐτοῖς ὁ

---

<sup>1</sup>Cr. 12:16 with Mk. 3:12; 16:20 with Mk. 8:30; 17:9 with Mk. 9:9.

Ἰησοῦς λέγων, Ὁρᾶτε μηδεὶς γινωσκέτω (v.30b) stand as a glaring exception to the general policy of the first evangelist.<sup>1</sup>

Undoubtedly, Matthew was acquainted with the other Markan story of the healing of a blind man (Mk. 8:22-26) as well as the story of Bartimaeus in Mk. 10:46-52, and it is, of course, conceivable that he has fashioned 9:27-31 with them both in mind.<sup>2</sup> However, the saying about faith in Mk. 10:52 (ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε), which the first evangelist has omitted in 20:34, is not verbally similar to the statement in 9:29b (κατὰ τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν γενηθήτω ὑμῖν). In view of what we have said above, it does not seem likely that the first evangelist would have preserved the command for silence from Mk. 8:26, which again is quite different from that in 9:30.

If, therefore, we conclude with Held that Matthew

---

<sup>1</sup>It could possibly be argued that Matthew has here included a command for silence because the men have recognized Jesus as "the Son of David" (v.27). Aside from the references in the prologue (1:1; 1:20) this is the first time that this title appears in the narrative, and, perhaps, Matthew has wished to have Jesus' Messiahship remain a secret. Unlike Mark, however, it is evident that Matthew has not consistently developed the secrecy-motif since he has already allowed Jesus to be addressed as "Lord" (8:2; 8:6,8; 8:25).

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Fenton, p. 144, and Streeter, p. 170, who suggest that Matthew is probably indebted to Mk. 8:22-26 for features in 9:27-31.

was totally free to form the 9:27-31 story as he pleased, we are left with the difficulties of v.28a and v.30b. For this reason, we turn to the explanation put forth by Strecker. He concludes that the first evangelist has here employed a story which in the pre-Matthean oral period was related to the Markan tradition, thus containing features which are found in the second Gospel, and has altered it to suit his own purposes.<sup>1</sup>

Undoubtedly, Matthew found this pericope useful primarily because of its theme of faith. It is impossible to determine whether the question πιστεύετε ὅτι δύναμαι τοῦτο ποιῆσαι (v.28) was a part of the original story or resulted from Matthew's hand.<sup>2</sup> In any case, it seems

---

<sup>1</sup>Strecker, pp. 199f., feels that Held has gone too far in supposing the Matthean authorship for it. Further, he rejects as inadequate Bultmann's suggestion that in 9:27-31 the first evangelist has brought together various elements. To account for the non-Matthean features in this pericope Strecker concludes that Matthew has taken it from the oral tradition. He calls attention to the work of Kilpatrick (pp. 40ff.), who has convincingly demonstrated that in certain passages Matthew drew on oral tradition. Kilpatrick does not suggest, however, that 9:27-31 is a result of this process (cf. pp. 89f.). Cf. also Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 180; T. H. Robinson, p. 83; Haenchen, Der Weg, pp. 370f.

<sup>2</sup>It is possible that this question, in some form, was connected with the "house" motif in the first half of v.28 since the entrance of Jesus into the house necessitates another beginning of the conversation between him and the blind men. In regard to the meaning

likely that he has added the words *κατὰ τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν γενηθήτω ὑμῖν* (v.29) to bring out the theme of faith more clearly.<sup>1</sup> Since this theme provides the link with the two preceding healing stories (9:18-26), 9:27-31 completes the third complex of miracle stories in chapters 8 and 9 and prepares the way for 9:32-34, which reveals the contradictory interpretations of Jesus' deeds by those who witness them.

In addition, it would appear that this story anticipates 12:23, where after witnessing the healing of the demoniac the crowd poses the question: *μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς Δαβὶδ?* In 9:27-31 the blind men address Jesus as "the Son of David"; in 12:23 the crowd perceives that Jesus is the expected Messiah. It is evident that Jesus' fame has spread throughout the district (v.31),<sup>2</sup> and, perhaps it is this reference which made it possible for

---

of this question, see McNeile, p. 127, who suggests that it was intended to spur on their faith and was not a means to seek information (thus also Lagrange, *Matthieu*, p. 189). Lohmeyer, *Matthäus*, p. 179, on the other hand, assumes that it was asked by Jesus because he was astonished at the greatness of their faith.

<sup>1</sup>Cf. 8:13 and 15:28, where Matthew's redaction is recognizable.

<sup>2</sup>Strecker, p. 199, assumes that v.31 is a Matthean addition. It should also be noted that there is no Markan parallel to v.26 (cf. Mk. 5:21-43).

Matthew to retain the order for silence in v.30b. It is obvious that Matthew was interested to note the dissemination of the news about Jesus as 9:26 also indicates.<sup>1</sup>

Finally, it seems certain that Matthew has employed 9:27-31 in preparation for 11:5, where the restoration of the sight of the blind stands as a sign of the Messianic time (cf. Is. 29:18 and 35:5).<sup>2</sup> Up to this point in the first Gospel Jesus has not given sight to the blind. Thus, this story reveals Jesus as the Messianic fulfiller whose deeds speak for themselves when John the Baptist wants to know if Jesus is the Christ (11:2).

We have seen that Matthew has adapted this pericope to emphasize the faith of the blind men who recognize Jesus as "the Son of David" in spite of their physical blindness.<sup>3</sup> Jesus responds to their faith by granting them eyesight, and the news of this happening cannot be contained but spreads throughout the entire land (v.31). Having so fashioned 9:27-31, Matthew has placed it after

---

<sup>1</sup>Allen, p. 97, supposes that the inclusion of v.26 and v.31 " . . . was preparing for the extension of Christ's work in the mission of the Twelve, which forms the subject of the next chapter."

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Bultmann, History, p. 212.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 179.



the stories in 9:18-26 because of its additional lesson regarding faith.

The Healing of the Dumb Demoniac--  
Mt. 9:32-34

There appears to be no reason to reject the conclusion of most commentators<sup>1</sup> that 9:32-34 has been composed by the first evangelist himself and parallels to some extent 12:22-24 and Lk. 11:14f. This story, like Lk. 11:14f., reports that a demon was cast out of a "dumb" (κωφόν) demoniac while 12:22-24 indicates that a "blind" (τυφλός) and "dumb" (κωφός) demoniac was healed. Further, both 9:33 and Lk. 11:14 include the following words: ἐλάλησεν ὁ κωφός. καὶ ἐθαύμασαν οἱ ὄχλοι while 12:22b, 23a contain the words ὥστε τὸν κωφὸν λαλεῖν καὶ βλέπειν. καὶ ἐξίσταντο πάντες οἱ ὄχλοι. In the light of this comparison it can be seen that at these points 9:32-34 parallels more closely Lk. 11:14f. than 12:22-24, and, perhaps, their agreement suggests that both are dependent upon a common source.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Thus Allen, Bonnard, Bultmann, Held, Lohmeyer, Schniewind and Strecker.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Kilpatrick, p. 90, and Johnson, I.B., vol. 7, p. 359. Allen, pp. 97f., feels that 9:32-34 would have introduced the Beelzebub controversy better than 12:22-24 since the demon is cast out (ἐκβληθέντος) while in 12:22 the word ἐθεράπευσεν is used.

In other respects, however, it is to be noted that 9:32-34 corresponds more closely to 12:22-24 than Lk. 11:14f. In both cases the crowd makes a positive response to the deed of Jesus, in the first instance with the words, "Never was anything like this seen in Israel" (οὐδέποτε ἐφάνη οὕτως ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ), and in the second with the question, "Can this be the Son of David?" (μήτις οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς Δαβὶδ). Finally, in each instance the opponents of Jesus are said to be the Pharisees (9:34, 12:24).<sup>1</sup> It would appear that these features are due to Matthew's redaction and that just one account, similar to what occurs in Lk. 11:14f., lay behind both 9:32-34 and 12:22-24.<sup>2</sup>

Some interpreters<sup>3</sup> suppose v.34 to be a later insertion since it is similar to 12:24 and Lk. 11:15 and has been omitted in a number of manuscripts (D it<sup>a, d, k</sup> syr<sup>s</sup> Hil). If, however, this statement of the Pharisees were added by a later redactor, then the original relationship between 9:32-34 and 12:22-24 would not have been nearly so close. In this case, it seems likely

---

<sup>1</sup>Cr. below, p. 202.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Lagrange, Matthieu, p. 190.

<sup>3</sup>Thus Bultmann, History, p. 212; Johnson, I.B., vol. 7, p. 360; McNeile, p. 128.

that Matthew would have formed vv.32,33 upon the basis of the Q material as it is given in Lk. 11:14. Consequently, it seems strange that the first evangelist would have added the statement of the crowd (v.33), which is not reported in Luke, and not also have mentioned the accusation of the Pharisees which appears both in 12:24 and Lk. 11:15 and parallels Mk. 3:22b. Thus, it seems unwise to conclude that v.34 was a later addition to the pericope.<sup>1</sup> The words are included in a reliable manuscript tradition, and, in addition, the first evangelist has employed this pattern of responses elsewhere in his Gospel (cf. 21:14-16 and 12:23,24).

9:32-34 brings to a close the second section of material in the first Gospel and discloses the two reactions which the deeds of Jesus elicited in Israel. For this reason, Held rightly concludes that it does not exhibit the normal pattern of a miracle story:

It [9:32-34] certainly does not portray a miracle story in the strict sense. It is true that it concerns the exorcism of a demon, but it is nevertheless quite clear that the chief weight does not lie on this but in the twofold reaction of the multitude and the Pharisees, which in both cases is brought to expression in a quotation.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Strecker, p. 101.

<sup>2</sup>P. 247. Held follows Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 180, who states: "Die Erzählung ist als Geschichte einer

This conclusion is strengthened when it is noted that in 9:32-34 Jesus is neither mentioned by name as in the previous sections (cf. 9:19,22,23,27) nor are his words reported. Further, unlike the stories in 9:18-31, faith is not a theme since neither the faith of those who bring the demoniac<sup>1</sup> nor the faith of the demoniac himself is mentioned.<sup>2</sup> Reference is made to the fact that the demoniac speaks (ἐλάλησεν ὁ κωφός) but, undoubtedly, this is mentioned as a demonstration of the cure and not because of any interest in the patient himself.

Matthew has joined 9:32-34 to 9:27-31 by means of the words αὐτῶν δὲ ἐξερχομένων,<sup>3</sup> undoubtedly to make it

---

Heilung unvollständig. Der Eingang und der Ausgang der Heilung werden berichtet; die Mitte, etwa ein Heilung schaffendes Wort Jesu oder eine entsprechende Gebärde (vgl. etwa Mk 7:34), fehlt. Aber statt dessen ist die Wirkung dieses Wunders breit geschildert; und in der doppelten Aussage liegt sichtlich die Absicht dieser Erzählung."

<sup>1</sup>Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 180, suggests that the fact that the dumb demoniac is brought to Jesus is a characteristic of a typical miracle story pattern since the demoniac himself would have been able to come to Jesus. Cf. 8:16 and 12:22.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Bonnard, pp. 138f.

<sup>3</sup>Filson, p. 123, thinks that this phrase refers to Jesus and his disciples as they leave the house (v.28) while McNeile, p. 128, assumes that it is a reference to the departure of the healed blind men. (Cf.

clear that the acts of Jesus forced all to take sides either for or against him. As elsewhere (cf. 9:3,8; 12:23f.; 21:15f.; 21:46; 23:2-7), the first evangelist has placed the crowd in a much more favourable light than the leaders of the Jewish religious community.

In the present context the accusation of the Pharisees (v.34) remains unanswered, but it will be voiced again in 12:24ff., where it receives a decisive answer. In addition, v.34 prepares the way for the words of Jesus to his disciples in 10:24f.: "If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more will they malign those of the household." Finally, it seems likely that Matthew has intended 9:32-34 as a preparation for 11:5, where the words  $\kappa\omega\phi\omicron\iota \acute{\alpha}\chi\omicron\upsilon\omicron\nu\sigma\iota\nu$  occur.<sup>1</sup>

We can thus state that the first evangelist has fashioned 9:32-34 as a conclusion to the miracles

---

Strecker, p. 96, and Lagrange, Matthieu, p. 190, who agree with this latter suggestion.) If the latter interpreters are correct, then both the crowd and the Pharisees would not be direct witnesses of the exorcism since it takes place within the house. Although it is doubtful that the first evangelist was attempting to be precise at this point, it seems more likely that by means of  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\upsilon\omicron\nu \delta\grave{\epsilon} \acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\rho\chi\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\nu$  Matthew has intended to picture the continuation of Jesus' journey with his disciples. The last reference to the disciples was in 9:19, but shortly they are to play a far more important role in the narrative (cf. 9:37f.; 10:1ff.).

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Bultmann, History, p. 212, and Richardson, p. 83. See also, however, McNeile, p. 129.



reported in chapters 8 and 9 and as a preparation for 11:5. It is not a miracle story in the normal sense but emphasizes the division of opinion in Israel regarding the work of Jesus.

The Healing of the Man with the Withered Hand--Mt. 12:9-14 (Mk. 3:1-6; Lk. 6:6-11)

In Mark this story stands at the end of a longer section of material (Mk. 2:1-3:6) and pictures the growing tension in the conflict between Jesus and his enemies over the right observance of the sabbath. Here Jesus' goodness stands in sharp contrast to the evil intentions of those who oppose him. In Matthew, however, the emphasis has shifted slightly. By his alteration of the Markan account the first evangelist has shown a greater interest in presenting a positive interpretation of Jesus' teaching concerning the sabbath than emphasizing in detail the conflict between Jesus and his opponents.

For example, Matthew has not mentioned the Herodians, who in Mk. 3:6 play a part in the plot directed against Jesus' life, but has referred only to the Pharisees (cf. 9:34). The reason for this might be quite simple. At the time the first Gospel was written the party of the Herodians was no longer in existence while the casuistry of the Pharisees continued to be a threat to the Chris-

tians even after the destruction of the temple in 70 A.D.<sup>1</sup> If this were the case, then Matthew was again in this instance not particularly interested in the opponents of Jesus per se but in providing a decisive and positive Christian answer to the question raised by the Pharisees' approach to the law.

Matthew's deletion of the description in Mk. 3:4b, 5a--the reference to the silence of the Pharisees in response to the direct question of Jesus and the

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Kilpatrick, pp. 106, 120f., and Knox, pp. 9f. The "Herodians" are again mentioned in 22:15f. (cf. Mk. 12:13) but in this instance they are the natural ones to oppose Jesus since the dispute concerns the obligation of the Jews toward Caesar. It is true that, like Mark, Matthew has presented both the scribes and the Pharisees as the principal adversaries of Jesus, but it is noteworthy that the first evangelist has sometimes added "Pharisees" to a reference to the "scribes" (cf. 23:2, 13, 15, 23, 25, 27, 29 with Mk. 12:37b-40) or has even substituted "Pharisees" for "scribes" (cf. 22:34 with Mk. 12:28 and 22:41 with Mk. 12:35). In addition, there are some passages in the Matthean Passion narrative where the first evangelist has eliminated a reference to the "scribes" (cf. 26:3 with Mk. 14:1; 26:47 with Mk. 14:43; 27:1 with Mk. 15:1) although, in fact, he has retained "scribes" in 26:57 and 27:41 while mentioning the "Pharisees" only once in chapters 26-28 (27:62). Although it can be seen that Matthew has tended to insert references to the "Pharisees," there is no evidence that he has drawn any clear distinction between the "Pharisees" and the "scribes." Cf. M. Black, "Scribe [γραμματεὺς]," *I.B.D.*, vol. 4, pp. 246-248, who suggests that "scribes and Pharisees" has become a stereotyped phrase in the first Gospel. Cf. further A. F. J. Klijn, "Scribes Pharisees Highpriests and Elders in the New Testament," *N.T.*, 3 (1959), pp. 259-267.

subsequent anger of Jesus at the hardness of their hearts--is further proof that he was not concerned to picture the conflict in detail. In addition, Mark has already drawn attention to the enemies and their evil intentions by picturing them as lying in wait for an opportunity to accuse him (Mk. 3:2), but Matthew has changed the scene by placing the opponents in the foreground and putting the following question into their mouths: "Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath?" (v.10b). In Mark this question is only thought by Jesus' enemies, and it is Jesus himself who directs the first question to them.<sup>1</sup> This change by Matthew is significant since it permits him to picture Jesus as responding to the Pharisees and at the same time, by means of the inserted saying in v.11,<sup>2</sup> as providing a positive guide for the Christian's observance of the sabbath. Held declares,

Into the healing of the withered hand on the Sabbath (Matt. 12:9-14) the evangelist has worked a scholastic conversation in which the question is posed (12:10) and answered (12:12) whether it is permissible to heal on the Sabbath. Whereas Mark (Mk. 3:1-6) transmits a

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. G. Barth, "Matthew's Understanding of the Law," Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew, trans. P. Scott (London, 1963), p. 79.

<sup>2</sup>Allen, p. 129, assumes that Matthew had to put the direct challenge in the mouths of the Pharisees to introduce vv.11,12 (thus also Haenchen, Der Weg, p. 125).

scholastic conversation in which Jesus justifies his attitude before his opponents, Matthew derives from the scholastic conversation a decision about teaching on behaviour on the Sabbath, and does so obviously for his Church.<sup>1</sup>

In other words, Matthew's alterations have shifted the major emphasis in the story from the controversy itself to the question of sabbath observance. By means of the word ἔξεστιν he has linked the question in v.10 with the words of Jesus in v.12b. Jesus does not pose the question regarding what is lawful on the sabbath as in Mk. 3:4 but gives a positive answer which would have proved valid for the Church.

By inserting vv.11,12a<sup>2</sup> the first evangelist has sought to strengthen his argument. Barth<sup>3</sup> thinks that Matthew was in this way appealing to the milder course which was often taken regarding the observance of the

---

<sup>1</sup>p. 244.

<sup>2</sup>A similar saying in Lk. 14:5 speaks of an ox, not a sheep. Streeter, pp. 259f., thinks that 12:11f. has resulted from a conflation with another version rather than from an editorial expansion of the Lukan saying while Bultmann, History, p. 131, reasons that v.12 " . . . is one of Matthew's well-known explanatory additions." This saying has probably been handed down in the tradition in various forms and the exact relationship between 12:11f. and Lk. 14:5 is almost impossible to determine.

<sup>3</sup>Op. cit., p. 79. Thus also Klostermann, Matthäus, p. 106. Cf. Strack-Billerbeck, vol. 1, pp. 629f. for the Rabbinic regulations.

sabbath regulations. Strecker,<sup>1</sup> however, argues that v.11 shows that Matthew was not sufficiently acquainted with the Rabbinic rule but was merely wanting to underline the fundamental issue--the care for animals must be subordinated to one's concern for his fellow men or, in other words, the moral law supersedes the ceremonial law.

Whether or not Matthew was familiar with the Rabbinic teachings, it would appear that he was here only arguing in a general way from the lesser to the greater good: if the Pharisees think that a sheep is valuable enough to require their concern even on a sabbath, how much more valuable is a man that they should be concerned about him also on the sabbath. For Matthew it was no longer a violation when one does something good on the sabbath, but, in fact, it is through such active concern that the law is fulfilled in the lives of those (cf. 19:16ff.; 22:35ff.) who follow the One who came to fulfil the whole law (cf. 5:17ff.).

Bonnard stresses the importance of the Matthean interpretation of this story when he says,

Le *ἐξουιν* prend ici une valeur nouvelle: il ne s'agit plus de savoir ce qu'il est permis de faire, à la rigueur, pendant le sabbat; l'idée juive du "repos" sabbatique fait place

---

<sup>1</sup>P. 19.



à l'idée évangélique d'une activité, spécialement d'une oeuvre de miséricorde ou de secours, qu'il est non seulement permis de faire mais qu'il "importe" d'accomplir sans retard.<sup>1</sup>

We have thus seen that by means of his redaction Matthew has set forth quite clearly this positive declaration that " . . . it is lawful to do good on the sabbath" (v.12) and, as a result, has intended the healing itself as a specific instance in the ministry of Jesus when an act of mercy took precedence over religious observance. It is obvious that the healing miracle which is reported briefly in v.13 has been subordinated to this far more important theme. This explains why no detailed interest is shown in the man himself except that his hand is withered (v.10a) and that he is cured by Jesus (v.13).<sup>2</sup>

Finally, Barth<sup>3</sup> suggests that both 12:9-14 and

---

<sup>1</sup>p. 176. Cf. also Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 185.

<sup>2</sup>In v.13 Matthew has added ὡς ἡ ἄλλη, probably to indicate that the man's hand was healed perfectly. Lagrange, Matthieu, p. 236, declares, "Mt. insiste sur la parfaite guérison."

<sup>3</sup>Op. cit., pp. 89ff. Barth bases much of his argument on the phrase μηδὲ σαββάτω in 24:20 which has no parallel in Mk. 13:18. He thinks that Matthew has inserted this phrase because of his more conservative attitude towards the law and the sabbath. Strecker, p. 32f., however, points out that 24:20 is probably the result of a Jewish apocalyptic text and needs not contradict the conclusion that with the abolition of the cultic law the ritual observance of the sabbath ended.

12:1-8 are further proof that the Matthean congregation continued to observe the sabbath although not so strictly as the Pharisees. This, however, is not at all certain. 12:1-14 could just as well support the opposite conclusion that the congregation for whom Matthew wrote was liberated from the demands of the sabbath to fulfil the greater demands of mercy (v.7) on the basis that Jesus himself in his earthly ministry was far more interested in acts of mercy than ceremonial observances. As the αὐτῶν in v.9 suggests,<sup>1</sup> it is indeed likely that the Matthean congregation had gradually separated itself from Pharisaic Judaism. Both 12:9-14 and the previous pericope would have provided assistance to the early Christians as they put into practice their new attitude towards the sabbath.

The Healing of the Blind and Dumb  
Demoniac--Mt. 12:22-24 (Lk. 11:14-16)

By reporting the healing of a demoniac in 12:22-24 Matthew has provided a more natural introduction to the

---

<sup>1</sup>See also 4:23; 9:35; 10:17; 13:54. Cf. Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 185. Strecker, pp. 30ff., finds evidence in the first Gospel which suggests that the Matthean congregation was not closely in touch with Judaism after 70 A.D. In fact, Strecker concludes that the peculiarly Jewish elements in Matthew belong to the early stage of the congregation's history and not to that time when the Gospel was written.

Beelzebub controversy (12:25-37) than that in Mark (cf. Mk. 3:19b-22). Since Luke has also preceded the Beelzebub controversy with a report that Jesus casts out a demon from a dumb man, it seems likely that these two evangelists have drawn upon a common source.<sup>1</sup>

In the strictest sense 12:22-24 cannot be considered a fully developed miracle story since the reference to the healing is used to set the stage for the reactions of the crowd and the Pharisees towards Jesus. When the people in the crowd witness the healing, they are astonished<sup>2</sup> and question, "Can this be the Son of David?"<sup>3</sup> Immediately the Pharisees respond by saying, "It is only by Beelzebub, the prince of demons, that this man casts out demons." As in 9:32-34, the response of the crowd has Christological significance and the Pharisees are

---

<sup>1</sup>As concluded above (pp. 196-198), 9:32,33a probably preserves more closely than 12:22,23a what was in the common source (cf. Lk. 11:14). Both Bultmann, History, pp. 13f., and Kilpatrick, p. 90, assume that the report of a healing was in Q. Cf. also Fuller, Miracles, p. 32, who thinks that Matthew has created 12:22.

<sup>2</sup>The verb ἐξίσταται occurs only in this verse in the first Gospel. It is sometimes supposed (thus Allen, p. 131; McNeile, p. 174; Strecker, p. 168) that ἐξίστατο is reminiscent of ἐξέρχεται in Mk. 3:21, but this does not seem likely since the word has quite different meanings in the two contexts.

<sup>3</sup>Both Schlatter, p. 403, and Lagrange, Matthieu, p. 241, draw attention to the fact that the word μὴτι, which introduces this question in the Greek, expects a negative answer.

specifically designated as the opponents of Jesus.<sup>1</sup> In the light of the use of "the Son of David" title the crowd's question in 12:23 was undoubtedly intended by Matthew as a development of the theme found in the more general statement in 9:33b, and as his inclusion of the word ἀποβάντες in v.24 indicates, it is precisely this question which precipitates the Pharisees' counter charge that Jesus is in the service of Beelzebub. By means of the word οὗτος Matthew has linked their answer to the crowd's question.<sup>2</sup>

It is obvious that the Christological issue is far more important to this section (12:22-37) than the reported healing. The charge against Jesus which was first voiced in 9:34 and then alluded to in 10:24f. is given a decisive answer here in chapter 12. Since the Beelzebub accusation is not again mentioned in the first Gospel, it seems certain that Matthew has viewed 12:27-29 as the conclusion to this controversy. According to Matthew, Jesus can announce that the Kingdom has come among them since, in fact, "die Gegenwart des Reiches Gottes ist

---

<sup>1</sup>It seems probable that in this case the first evangelist has substituted οἱ φαρισαῖοι for the more original τινὲς δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν (Lk. 11:15). Cf. Bultmann, History, pp. 14,309f.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. McNeile, p. 174.

die Person Jesu selbst." [In the original "die" is the beginning of a sentence.]<sup>1</sup>

The account of the healing itself is recounted in a somewhat stereotyped manner. It is simply reported in the space of one verse that the demoniac, described as blind and mute (δαιμονιζόμενος τυφλὸς καὶ κωφός), is brought to Jesus and is healed<sup>2</sup> so that he is able to speak and see.

Although the essential elements of a miracle story are present in this case (the bringing and description of the patient, the report and confirmation of the healing, and the reaction of the witnesses), it is obvious, as we have observed, that 12:22-24 is intended as a preparation for what follows. When 12:22-24 is taken together with 12:25ff., the whole of it comes close to what is normally classified as a pronouncement story.<sup>3</sup>

The Feeding of the Five Thousand--  
Mt. 14:13-21 (Mk. 6:30-44; Lk. 9:10-17)

As elsewhere (cf. 8:28-34; 9:18-26) Matthew has here abbreviated quite substantially the Markan

---

<sup>1</sup>Schniewind, Matthäus, p. 159.

<sup>2</sup>It is interesting to note that Matthew has used the word θεραπεύειν and not ἐκβάλλειν (cf. Lk. 11:14).

<sup>3</sup>Bultmann, History, pp. 13f., lists 12:22-37 as one of the passages in which the conflict sayings are occasioned by a healing of Jesus.



narrative. At the same time, however, he has introduced certain new details. Probably much of the abbreviation was done for stylistic reasons, but even so we must consider whether the Matthean reworking of the text has altered its meaning in any way. Since, unlike Mark, Matthew has not referred to the commissioning of the disciples in the previous narrative (cf. Mk. 6:7), he obviously could not describe their return and Jesus' subsequent command that they retire to a deserted place for nourishment and rest. Instead, Matthew has closely linked Jesus' withdrawal to the preceding narrative which relates the fate of John the Baptist.<sup>1</sup> He has indicated that the disciples of John come to Jesus to inform him of the death of their master (v. 12--καὶ ἐλθόντες ἀπήγγειλαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ), and it is for this reason that Jesus withdraws.<sup>2</sup>

The retreat of Jesus into a deserted place, however, does not prevent the people from hearing (ἀκούσαντες, not εἶδον as in Mk. 6:33) of his whereabouts and following (ἠκολούθησαν) him there on foot. As in Mark, Jesus is

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Lagrange, Matthieu, pp. 289f., and Haenchen, Der Weg, pp. 246f.

<sup>2</sup>Matthew has elsewhere employed the word ἀναχωρεῖν to indicate that Jesus avoids open conflict with his opponents which might prematurely bring about his death. Cf. esp. 4:12; 12:15; 15:21. See also 2:14 and 2:22. Cf. Schniewind, Matthäus, p. 178.

moved to compassion when he sees the great multitude, but, unlike the Markan account, no specific reason is given for this feeling of pity.<sup>1</sup> In Mark the reason is the appearance of the crowd as sheep without a shepherd (Mk. 6:34b), but Matthew has omitted this reference, perhaps because he has already included these words in 9:36.<sup>2</sup>

What is probably more significant is the fact that in Matthew Jesus' first action is healing the sick among them (v.14b--*καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν τοὺς ἀρρώστους αὐτῶν*) rather than teaching them as in the Markan Gospel. Elsewhere (cf. 19:2 with Mk. 10:1; 21:14 with Mk. 11:11) Matthew has altered Mark to draw attention to Jesus' healing ministry, and it is evident that in this instance he has assumed that the healing is more appropriate than teaching as the prelude to the miraculous feeding. No matter what relationship Matthew might have seen between Jesus'

---

<sup>1</sup>In view of the Matthean context Bonnard, p. 218, declares, ". . . malgré le rejet de Jésus à Nazareth (13:53-58) et la fin tragique du Précurseur (14:1-12), les foules se presentent autour de Jésus (v.13) qui prend pitié d'elles (v.14)."

<sup>2</sup>Why the first evangelist has relocated this saying and put it in the summary in 9:35-38 cannot be answered with any certainty. Perhaps he was suggesting that the crowds in general which Jesus helps are as sheep without a shepherd and are desperately in need of his teaching and his healing.

healing of the sick and his multiplication of the bread,<sup>1</sup> it seems clear that in both cases Jesus is portrayed as the One who miraculously answers the needs of those assembled around him.

Matthew's abbreviation of the conversation between Jesus and his disciples is probably more important than the above changes. In Mark the disciples respond to the initial command of Jesus that they feed the hungry crowd (Mk. 6:37) by inquiring how much food they would be required to purchase. It is then that Jesus directs them to discover how much food is available in that place, and returning to Jesus the disciples report the number of loaves and fish. By omitting both the discussion regarding the purchase of food and the question of Jesus (v.16) Matthew has greatly consolidated this narrative, presenting it in the following way: at the outset Jesus indicates that it will not be necessary to send the people away since the disciples are to supply them with food to eat; straightway the disciples report the inadequacy of their provisions to which Jesus responds by requesting

---

<sup>1</sup>Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 236, suggests that Jesus' healing activity made those who were ceremonially unclean eligible to join in the cultic meal which was to follow. It seems doubtful that Matthew has intended this reference to the healing of Jesus to have any such meaning.

that these be brought to him; he then commands the crowd to be seated on the grass; and finally he blesses the food and has it distributed to the people.

It would appear that Matthew has altered this Markan section (cf. Mk. 6:37-40)<sup>1</sup> not only for stylistic reasons but also for reasons of content. He has added the words οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχουσιν ἀπελθεῖν in v.16 and ὁ δὲ εἶπεν φέρετέ μοι ὧδε αὐτοῦς in v.18. Kilpatrick assumes that both these phrases " . . . add nothing to the story except that they make the sequence and connexion a little more explicit."<sup>2</sup> It does not seem likely, however, that Matthew has made these insertions only for this reason. In fact, Held supposes that Matthew's reshaping of the conversation is quite important and reveals something of his view towards the theme of discipleship:

If Matthew does not mention that bold counter-question the reason for this lies in the fact that he interprets the role of disciples differently. There is no trace of a lack of understanding of the commission of Jesus (Matt. 14:16 δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν) in the reply of the disciples. Such a misunderstanding as that in Mark is excluded by the fact that Matthew precedes it with the small sentence οὐ χρεῖαν

---

<sup>1</sup>It should be noted that Matthew has omitted certain Markan details: v.39--συνπόσια συμπόσια . . . . χλωρῶ; v.40--καὶ ἀνέκεσαν πρᾶσαι πρᾶσαι κατὰ ἑκατὸν καὶ κατὰ πεντήκοντα.

<sup>2</sup>Kilpatrick, p. 74.

ἔχουσιν ἀπελθεῖν. This at once makes clear that Jesus is not thinking of the food which one has to buy in the townships. It is obvious that he means nourishment which the disciples have with them. Hence they immediately announce the amount of food which is available (Matt. 14:17: ὧδε). Thus the disciples understand what Jesus means, though they do not obediently carry out his commission but point out--obviously as an expression of their limited faith--how meagre are their provisions: "We have here but five loaves and two fishes."<sup>1</sup>

Beyond this, Held concludes that Matthew has deliberately highlighted the mediating role of the disciples during the feeding of the five thousand. No longer do they arrange the people in groups (cf. v.19 with Mk. 6:39f.), but they function exclusively as communicators of the food to the crowd. They bring the food to Jesus (v.18), and then after Jesus has blessed and broken the bread, they give it to the people. In fact, Matthew has drawn attention to the participation of the disciples by specifically referring to them a second time in the same verse: κλάσας ἔδωκεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς τοὺς ἄρτους, οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις (v.19). According to Held,<sup>2</sup> the assistance the disciples give in distributing the food to the people has become for Matthew the execution of Jesus' initial commission to them (v.16--δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν). In

---

<sup>1</sup>P. 183.

<sup>2</sup>P. 184.



other words, Matthew was primarily concerned in this pericope to emphasize the " . . . role of the disciples, who at the commission of Jesus feed the multitude."<sup>1</sup> It is for this reason that Held has classified this feeding miracle story under his general theme of discipleship.

Since a longer period of time lay between him and the earliest tradition, the first evangelist--more so than Mark--would have seen this feeding narrative in connexion with the celebration of the Eucharist in the Church.<sup>2</sup> This possibly explains why Matthew has failed to mention the fish as often as Mark has (cf. Mk. 6:41c, 43b).<sup>3</sup> Bread, not fish, was an essential part of the Eucharistic meal. If indeed Matthew was consciously associating this feeding miracle with the Eucharist, it is understandable that he would have wanted to emphasize the role of the disciples as mediators of the gracious gift in the bread which came from the hand of Jesus.

Matthäus schildert hier die Jünger Christi als die liturgischen Amtsträger, die bei der Abendmahlsfeier das Brot heranbringen und das

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid. Cf. also Fuller, Miracles, p. 80.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. van Iersel, op. cit., pp. 192f.

<sup>3</sup>McNeile, p. 215, draws attention to the omission of the words τοὺς ἄρτους (cf. Mk. 6:41) in v.19 after the verb κλάειν. This suggests that it was with one action that Jesus broke both the bread and fish.

von Christus gespendete Brot an die Gemeinde austeilten, wie Jesus es einst denjenigen gab, die er zum Apostelamt berufen hatte.<sup>1</sup>

It is possible, however, that this emphasis on the disciples' role was only a secondary result of Matthew's redactional work. If Matthew was principally interested to portray Jesus as the helper of those in need, then he could have rearranged the conversation to demonstrate that Jesus acts solemnly according to this motive. The first evangelist has frequently avoided having Jesus ask a question since he probably assumed this to be inappropriate to the One who is now the Lord of the Church,<sup>2</sup> and this could explain his elimination of the question in v.17 (cf. Mk. 6:38). In addition, Matthew has possibly inserted οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν ἀπελθεῖν as Jesus' first words to demonstrate that he is the master of the situation from the outset and knows that the crowd would be satisfied by means of his miraculous action.<sup>3</sup>

All this is not to deny the conclusions which were

---

<sup>1</sup>Van Iersel, op. cit., pp. 192f.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Bonnard, pp. 219f. Cf. also above, p. 187.

<sup>3</sup>Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 236, understands these words as an anticipation of the miracle itself. It should also be noted that Matthew has increased the miracle by adding the following words: χωρὶς γυναικῶν καὶ παιδῶν (cf. 15:38).

reached by Held, but it is merely to suggest that in this pericope Matthew is perhaps first of all concerned to present Jesus as the One who provides nourishment for those who are in need. It is in the light of this emphasis that the participation of the disciples gains significance. As the Matthean Church experienced in its celebration of the Eucharist, Jesus feeds his people with bread and uses his disciples in a ministry of service.

Jesus' Walking on the Water--  
Mt. 14:22-33 (Mk. 6:45-52)

Matthew's account of this miracle story parallels rather closely the Markan version except for his insertion of the striking episode involving Peter's attempt to walk on the water (vv.28-31). This addition makes his interpretation of the pericope clear. In 14:22-33 the first evangelist has presented the theme of discipleship in a different manner from Mark as the final verse indicates most forcibly (v.33). While Mark has emphasized the apparent blindness of the disciples to the Messianic significance of Jesus' deeds (cf. Mk. 6:52), Matthew has reported that the ones in the boat (οἱ δὲ ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ), presumably the disciples, recognize the divine Sonship of Jesus as a result of the foregoing

experience.

In light of the numerous parallels to the Markan pericope, we assume with most interpreters<sup>1</sup> that Matthew has intentionally altered the narrative as he knew it in the second Gospel. In addition to the omission of πρὸς Βηθσαιδάν (Mk. 6:45),<sup>2</sup> the insertion of the words κατ' ἰδίαν in v.23, and the repetition of the word ἀπολύειν in v.23a (ἀπολύσας τοὺς ὄχλους) in order to provide a smooth link with v.22a (ἕως οὗ ἀπολύσῃ τοὺς ὄχλους), the first evangelist has made certain other noticeable changes. He has stated that the disciples' boat is already many furlongs from the land<sup>3</sup> when evening comes, and, further, unlike Mark, he has not reported that Jesus sees his disciples distressed in the rowing (καὶ ἰδὼν

---

<sup>1</sup>Thus Schlatter, p. 470; T. H. Robinson, p. 131; Held, pp. 204-206; Strecker, pp. 198f. For the contrary opinion, cf. Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 239, who assumes that 14:23b-32 is not based on the Markan account.

<sup>2</sup>Matthew has probably omitted πρὸς Βηθσαιδάν to avoid an apparent contradiction since in v.34 it is reported that they land at Gennesaret (so Strecker, p. 97). Cf. further Schmidt, p. 194, who (followed by Klostermann, Matthäus, p. 129) suggests that Matthew has eliminated the reference to Bethsaida since already in 11:21 Jesus has pronounced a "woe" over the city.

<sup>3</sup>The alternative reading μέσον τῆς θαλάσσης ἦν, supported by S C R (D) p<sup>m</sup> lat, is probably an interpolation to bring Matthew into agreement with Mk. 6:47.

αὐτοὺς βασανιζομένους ἐν τῷ ἐλαύνειν) but has pictured the boat as being harassed by the waves (v.24--βασανιζόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων). Having omitted the puzzling words in Mark καὶ ἤθελεν παρελθεῖν αὐτοῖς (Mk. 6:48c) Matthew has used the word μαθηταί in v.26 to mention explicitly the presence of the disciples and by means of the words καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου has drawn attention to the fear of the disciples when they assume Jesus to be a ghost.

Although, like Mark, Matthew has emphasized the disciples' terror,<sup>1</sup> it is important to note that, unlike Mark, he has supposed that Jesus' words θαρσεῖτε, ἐγώ εἰμι μὴ φοβεῖσθε immediately dispel this fear. Held stresses this feature when he says,

The reproduction of the story in Matthew also portrays the horror of the disciples, though only at the beginning (Matt. 14:26). At the end, on the other hand, stands their confession of their Lord who has wonderfully revealed himself to them (Matt. 14:33): οἱ δὲ ἐν τῷ κλοιῷ προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες ἀληθῶς θεοῦ υἱὸς εἶ.<sup>2</sup>

The fear of the disciples is pictured in the Matthean narrative as being only momentary since Jesus'

---

<sup>1</sup>Strecker, p. 193, observes that the first evangelist has elsewhere eliminated Markan references to the "Furcht" of the disciples (cf. 8:27 with Mk. 4:41; 17:4 with Mk. 9:6; 17:23 with Mk. 9:32).

<sup>2</sup>Fp. 204f.



words of encouragement (v.27b) receive an immediate and positive response from Peter. By means of Peter's request (v.28) the first evangelist has skilfully introduced this episode--Peter's attempt to walk on the water to Jesus--which is peculiar to his Gospel.<sup>1</sup> The ἐγώ εἰμι in 14:27b is reiterated in the question of Peter, κύριε, εἰ σὺ εἶ . . . (14:28), and is again echoed in the final verse of the story (14:33--ἀληθῶς θεοῦ υἱὸς εἶ). In addition to this connexion, both sections of the narrative include references to the "wind" (ἄνεμος in 14:24 and 14:30,32) and the notion of fear (14:26,27 and 14:30).<sup>2</sup>

As in 8:23-27, Matthew was here principally concerned to illustrate the meaning of discipleship<sup>3</sup> but

---

<sup>1</sup>In light of the number of words which are characteristically Matthean, Kilpatrick, pp. 40f., concludes that 14:28-31 has either resulted from an oral tradition put in writing by Matthew or from a pre-Matthean written source which was totally reworked by him. Kilpatrick notes that the word ὕδατα instead of θάλασσα (cf. Mk. 6:47) occurs in v.28 and supposes that it is due to the redaction of the first evangelist since Matthew has elsewhere substituted it for θάλασσα (cf. 8:32 with Mk. 5:13). In addition, both καταπονίζειν (cf. 18:6) and διστάζειν (cf. 28:17) appear only in the first Gospel and ὀλιγόπιστε (8:26; 16:8), κλεῦειν (8:18; 14:9; 14:19; 27:58), and κύριε, σῶσον (cf. 8:25) are elsewhere substituted by Matthew into the Markan context. Cf. also Held, p. 205.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Held, p. 205.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. E. Lövestam, "Wunder und Symbolhandlung. Eine Studie über Matthäus 14:28-31," Kerygma und Dogma, 8 (1962), pp. 124-135, for the Old Testament background.

in view of the Petrine episode a new aspect is forcibly established. The disciples of Jesus are not only witnesses of the Lord's miraculous appearance which implies their rescue in the time of danger, but, encouraged by his presence, they also share in his prerogatives.

When Peter<sup>1</sup> asks to join his Lord on the water, his request is immediately granted. In this way Matthew has alluded to the uniqueness of Christian discipleship. The disciple is given the opportunity to stand where the Lord stands, and it is only because of Peter's lack of faith that he meets with failure.<sup>2</sup> Peter walks on the water towards Jesus until he becomes fearful at the sight of the wind and begins to sink. As the disciple fails in the time of testing, the Lord saves him in answer to his cry for help (cf. 8:25). Lagrange has concisely summarized vv.28-31 in the following words: "La foi opère ce prodige. Le doute risque de tout perdre. Le recours à la prière sauve tout."<sup>3</sup>

Thus, in this episode Matthew has illustrated two

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew has included other passages, lacking in Mark, which centre around the disciple Peter (cf. 16:17ff., 17:24ff., 18:21f.).

<sup>2</sup>Matthew has here spoken of "little faith" (ὀλιγόπιστε) and not a complete absence of it.

<sup>3</sup>Matthieu, p. 295.

significant aspects of discipleship--on the one hand, the disciple is given the power to follow his Lord, but, on the other hand, it is inevitable that the disciple will constantly fail in his attempt because of little faith. Schlatter emphasizes this latter feature by concluding, " . . . das Ziel der Erzählung liegt nicht darin, die wunderbare Macht des Apostels zu feiern, sondern darin, seine Unfähigkeit zum Glauben darzutun."<sup>1</sup>

Finally, we must return to v.33, where Jesus is confessed to be "the Son of God." As Held notes, the Matthean conclusion differs from that of Mark not only in the disciples' recognition of the revelation of the Son of God but also because of the content of vv.28-31. He states,

In short: the scene of Peter walking on the sea not only has an ecclesiological meaning inasmuch as it uses the motive of discipleship, it also has a Christological aim. Christ is not only the deliverer of his own from need and danger; rather, he gives his disciple a share in his power to walk on the water.<sup>2</sup>

We have observed that in this instance Matthew has supplemented the Markan miracle story by inserting the Petrine episode and thus has effectively highlighted

---

<sup>1</sup>P. 471.

<sup>2</sup>P. 272. Cf. further Lövestam, op. cit., p. 135.

another aspect of the theme of discipleship. Those in the early Church would understand its lesson, for they knew that they participated in the power and authority belonging uniquely to the Lord as long as they did not doubt his adequacy to support them at all times.

The Healing of the Daughter of the  
Canaanite Woman--Mt. 15:21-28  
(Mk. 7:24-30)

Like Mark, Matthew has placed this story directly after the section which reports the conflict with the scribes and Pharisees regarding ceremonial washing. Although it is possible that the first evangelist has employed an account of the story of a different tradition from that of Mark,<sup>1</sup> it is just as likely that he has used the Markan account and has altered it to suit his own purposes.<sup>2</sup> In any case, it is necessary to observe the differences between the Markan and Matthean accounts in order to assess the unique way in which the first evangelist has interpreted this story.

As elsewhere (8:5ff. and 9:18ff.) Matthew has here highlighted the faith of the person who comes to Jesus

---

<sup>1</sup>Thus Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 252; Schlatter, p. 491; Streeter, pp. 259f.; Dodd, Hist. Tradition, p. 190.

<sup>2</sup>Thus Allen, p. 169; Bonnard, p. 230; Held, pp. 198f.; Strecker, pp. 107f.; Kilpatrick, p. 50.

with a request. In Mark the words of the woman<sup>1</sup> are not directly quoted until after Jesus has spoken to her (cf. Mk. 7:27) while in Matthew she addresses him with the words ἐλέησόν με, κύριε υἱὸς Δαβὶδ and indicates her daughter's malady at the very outset of the story (v.22).<sup>2</sup> The κύριος title<sup>3</sup> is again used in v.25 when after an apparent rebuff from Jesus the woman reverently bows before him (προσεκύνει) and pleads: κύριε, βοήθει μοι. It is obvious that the first evangelist has been concerned to picture this woman as one who recognizes Jesus' Messiahship and trusts him to help her, but, in addition, it is noteworthy that Matthew has put into the mouth of

---

<sup>1</sup>It should be noted that the woman is designated in Mk. 7:26 by means of the words Ἑλληνίς, Συροφονιζίσσα τῇ γένει while in v.22 she is named a Χαναανίσα. Kilpatrick, pp. 132f., accepts this latter designation as possible evidence for locating the Matthean Church somewhere in Phoenicia. R. A. Harrisville, "The Woman of Canaan," Interpretation, 20 (July, 1966), pp. 280f., suggests that Matthew has used Χαναανίσα because he has wanted to heighten " . . . the religious opposition between Israel and the Gentiles."

<sup>2</sup>In Mk. 7:26b the woman's request regarding her daughter is in indirect speech. Cf. Bultmann, History, pp. 312f., and Held, pp. 234f.

<sup>3</sup>κύριος does occur in Mk. 7:28, but this is the only time in the second Gospel that the title is applied directly to Jesus. Matthew has retained the ναί, κύριε in v.24, but in the light of his use of the κύριος and υἱὸς Δαβὶδ titles elsewhere in this pericope and throughout his Gospel he has undoubtedly invested it with a much richer meaning than has Mark.



this Gentile the "Son of David" title, a particularly Jewish Messianic term. In this instance, the combination of the "Son of David" and "Lord" titles not only demonstrates the faith of the woman but also suggests that she recognizes that Jesus was the Messiah sent to Israel. This theme receives stress elsewhere in the story, and we must return to it later.

In addition, it should be noted that Matthew has featured the conversation which takes place between Jesus and the woman. Although the dialogue comprises a major portion of the Markan pericope (Mk. 7:27-29), it does not completely dominate the story as is the case in Matthew.<sup>1</sup> In fact, the Markan account exhibits more characteristics of a typical miracle story as the concluding verse shows (Mk. 7:30): "And she went home, and found the child lying on the bed, and the demon gone." In Matthew, however, the dialogue culminates in v.28a,<sup>2</sup> where Jesus commends the woman for her great faith, and in v.28b the healing is mentioned quite formally without any reference to the demon (καὶ ἰάθη ἡ θυγάτηρ αὐτῆς ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης). It is clear that the first evangelist was

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Held, pp. 197f.

<sup>2</sup>Held, p. 199, declares: "In Matthew the whole narrative is directed towards this last sentence which has a majestic note about it."

much more interested in the theme of faith than in the healing itself.<sup>1</sup>

By including the words of Jesus in v.24 ( οὐκ ἀπεστάλην εἰ μὴ εἰς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ ), Matthew has shown just how remarkable the faith of this Gentile is. Even in the face of Jesus' apparent refusal of her request, she displays great persistence and again approaches him (v.25). Finally, her response to Jesus' declaration, "It is not fair to take the children's bread and throw it to the dogs," reveals her willingness to submit herself to the determined policy of Jesus, whose mission is to the house of Israel (v.24). As we have noted above, it is indeed possible that this is why the first evangelist has placed the "Son of David" cry at the outset of the story: he intended to indicate that the woman acknowledges the exclusiveness of Jesus' mission. All this further highlights the faith of this Gentile.

It is significant that the strict Jewish-Christian standpoint is acknowledged by the Matthaean narrative and yet is overcome by the great faith of the Gentile woman, and in the presence of Jesus himself.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Filson, p. 180, states, "The story is more a lesson in faith than a miracle story . . . "

<sup>2</sup>Held, p. 198.

As certain interpreters have observed,<sup>1</sup> Matthew has depicted the woman's faith in a manner similar to that by which he has described the faith of the centurion in 8:5-13. As we have already seen,<sup>2</sup> however, these two stories portray the attitude of Jesus quite differently. In 8:5-13 Jesus immediately responds to the centurion and shows his willingness to help while in 15:21-28 he does not at first even answer the woman (v.23) and only does so after the disciples ask that she be sent away.<sup>3</sup> McNeile supposes that the words of the disciples ἀπόλυσον αὐτήν mean: "Do what she asks, so that she may go away."<sup>4</sup> This interpretation, however, seems less likely than that which understands these words as an outright request that she be turned away because she is an annoying Gentile. This latter interpretation

---

<sup>1</sup>So Held, Lohmeyer, and Schniewind.

<sup>2</sup>See above, pp. 152f.

<sup>3</sup>Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 253, declares: "Er [Jesus] antwortet ihnen [disciples], aber Seine Antwort ist nicht für sie; Er spricht nicht von dem, was Ihm jetzt begegnet, sondern von dem, wozu Er 'immer' gesandt ist, Er antwortet nicht auf das Verlangen der Jünger: 'Schicke sie fort,' sondern auf das Flehen der Frau: 'Herr, erbarme Dich!' Was die Jünger gesagt haben, ist wie im Leeren verhallt; aber Jesu Schweigen ist gebrochen, und in Seiner Antwort sieht Er nur die Mutter, trotzdem sie an die Jünger sich richtet."

<sup>4</sup>Pp. 230f. Cf. also Haenchen, Der Weg, p. 275.

conforms better with the fact that according to Matthew Jesus sends his disciples only to " . . . the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (10:6). If this is correct, then both the disciples--although undoubtedly for less exalted reasons than those of Jesus--and Jesus himself hesitate to grant the request of this Gentile woman.

The saying in v.24<sup>1</sup> seemingly has a definite Jewish slant and is used by Matthew to establish the particularity of Jesus' mission. If ἀφ' ἑκ πρώτου χορτασθῆναι τὰ τέχνα is the original reading in Mk. 7:27,<sup>2</sup> it is not at first obvious why the first evangelist has eliminated these words since presumably there would have been Gentile Christians in the Matthean congregation to whom the emphasis of the Markan account would appeal. If πρῶτον,

---

<sup>1</sup>Bultmann, History, p. 155, thinks that the logion in v.24 is the product of the missionary debates engaged in by the Palestinian Church, but Jeremias, Promise to Nations, p. 27, argues for its authenticity: "It is impossible to question the authenticity of Matt. 15:24: to a church which even before Paul's time had accepted the Gentile mission (Acts 11:20ff.), such a 'particularist' saying must have been repugnant in the highest degree. It is hardly accidental that Matt. 15:24, as well as the similar saying in Matt. 10:5f., is absent from Mark and Luke. Matthew's only reason for preserving the logion in spite of its repellent implication was that it bore the stamp of the Lord's authority."

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Held, p. 198, following Bultmann, History, p. 38, who assumes that πρῶτον is a later addition to the text. Cf. also McNeile, p. 231.

which stresses the priority of Jesus' mission to the Jews over that to the Gentiles, was in Mk. 7:27, it would appear that Matthew has omitted it because he considered it to be a contradiction to Jesus' words in v.24.<sup>1</sup> It was perhaps his historical interest in the life of Jesus rather than a Jewish bias which caused Matthew to emphasize the exclusiveness of the Lord's mission to the house of Israel.<sup>2</sup>

In any case, Matthew has presented the mission of Jesus differently from Mark. In Mark Jesus hesitates

---

<sup>1</sup>Burkill, Z.N.W., 57 (1966), p. 26, states, "Also, the introduction of this pronouncement [15:24] is doubtless associated with the evangelist's decision to omit the saying of Mark 7:27a ('Let the children first be fed'), which could be taken to signify that the Messiah himself, within the confines of his earthly life, is intended to work first among Jews, then among Gentiles." Cf. also Taylor, Mark, p. 350, and Knox, p. 54.

<sup>2</sup>Strecker, p. 109, (contrary to Bonnard, pp. 231f.) concludes, "Da die Ausschliesslichkeit der Sendung Jesu nicht auf die Situation der Gemeinde des Matthäus bezogen werden kann, lässt sie sich nur 'historisch' verifizieren: Der Blick richtet sich auf die Vergangenheit, auf das Leben Jesu. Indem das Logion seines ursprünglichen Sitzes in den Missionsdebatten des Urchristentums enthoben ist, hat es demnach nicht eine neue, aktuelle Stellung im Leben der Gemeinde erhalten, sondern ist in die Einmaligkeit des historischen Auftrags Jesu zurückgetragen. Wenn seine partikularistische Tendenz im matthäischen Zusammenhang gegenüber der Markusvorlage betont erscheint, so also nur als 'Wort Jesu'!" Cf. further Lagrange, Matthieu, pp. 307f.



to help this Gentile because this would deprive "the children" (Mk. 7:27), but in Matthew Jesus initially withholds his assistance since his sole mission is to seek " . . . the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Or, in Mark Jesus' decision is determined by historical necessity while in Matthew it is ordained by divine plan.

Nonetheless, all this does not imply that Matthew has failed to utilize this story as a pointer to the universalism known to the Church in his day. By portraying the woman's faith as he has, Matthew has made it perfectly clear " . . . that faith opens the way for the Gentiles to Jesus."<sup>1</sup>

It is obvious that the healing miracle itself, which is briefly narrated in 15:28b, is completely subordinated to the two dominant themes regarding faith and the place of the Gentiles in the Church. For this reason, 15:21-28 is not a typical miracle story but rather serves as a vehicle for teaching the early Church about the faith of this Gentile.

---

<sup>1</sup>Held, p. 200.

The Feeding of the Four Thousand--  
Mt. 15:32-39 (Mk. 8:1-10)

As in the first feeding narrative (14:13-21) Matthew has abbreviated the Markan account, but in this instance the alterations seem to have been made principally for stylistic reasons. Like Mark, the first evangelist has indicated that Jesus himself initiates the action by calling his disciples and informing them of his compassion for the people in the crowd who have already remained with him three days and are without food. Presumably Matthew has seen no reason to retain the words which introduce this story in the second Gospel (Mk. 8:1a) since the assembled crowd has already been mentioned in v.30 and their hunger referred to by Jesus in v.32. This omission and that of a part of Mk. 8:3 have helped to make the narrative more concise.

Although it has been suggested that the words ἀπὸ μακρόθεν in Mk. 8:3 are an indirect reference to "Gentiles" (cf. μακρὰν in Eph. 2:13,17) and therefore indicate that the second Markan feeding narrative is for a non-Jewish crowd,<sup>1</sup> Matthew's omission of these words suggests that they held no particular significance for

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. above, pp. 85-97, for the consideration of Mk. 8:1-10.

him.<sup>1</sup> Whether or not it is the intention of Matthew to portray a miracle accomplished by Jesus on behalf of the Gentiles cannot be readily determined. Since in 15:21-28 Jesus is in Gentile territory and simply comes alongside the Sea of Galilee in 15:29-31, certain commentators<sup>2</sup> conclude that this feeding takes place in a non-Jewish area and, therefore, presupposes a Gentile crowd.

The previous summary section which replaces the Markan account of the healing of the deaf mute (Mk. 7:31-37) and also seems to accent the Isaianic background (cf. Is. 35:5f.) ends by stating that after witnessing the healings of Jesus the people glorify "the God of Israel" (v.31c--καὶ ἐδόξασαν τὸν θεὸν Ἰσραὴλ). At first this appears to support the argument that the first evangelist has wanted to depict a Gentile crowd.<sup>3</sup> Bonnard, however, argues that by means of the words παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας in v.29 (cf. Mk. 7:31) Matthew has brought Jesus back into Jewish territory so

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew has used μακρόθεν only twice in his Gospel, and on each occasion it has the normal meaning--"from a distance" (see 26:58 and 27:55).

<sup>2</sup>Thus Lohmeyer, Matthäus, pp. 257f.; Schniewind, Matthäus, p. 185; Fenton, p. 259; Johnson, I.B., vol. 7, p. 444.

<sup>3</sup>Thus, e.g., McNeile, pp. 232f.

that the crowd which is fed is not composed of Gentiles but Jews who alone are able to glorify "the God of Israel."

En effet, selon la conception matthéenne, pensons-nous, le récit de la multiplication des pains est unimaginable hors des frontières du peuple élu et, d'autre part, hors de la présence des multitudes malades. Il n'est pas sans utilité de relever que Mat. ne raconte que des rencontres personnelles de Jésus avec des païens (Centenier de Capernaüm, Syro-phénicienne); il ne nous le montre pas ému de compassion sur les multitudes des grandes cités de Phénicie et de Syrie. Les foules de notre péricope "glorifient le Dieu d' Israël" (v.31), ce que des païens ne pouvaient faire.<sup>1</sup>

Although it is not at all certain that the Matthean Jesus never encounters or helps Gentile crowds (cf. 14: 34-36), in light of the definite allusion to the Messianic hopes (cf. Is. 35:5f.), which were part of Israel's heritage, and the strong Jewish flavour of the story in 15:21-28 it must be allowed as a possibility that in v.31 the first evangelist has intended to show a Jewish crowd praising the God of Israel, who now reveals himself in the miraculous healings wrought by the hands of Jesus.

What is more certain than the above is that Matthew

---

<sup>1</sup>Bonnard, pp. 233f. Cf. further Lagrange, Matthieu, p. 311. Haenchen, Der Weg, p. 277, asserts, "Dieser Schluss [15:31] lässt vermuten, dass Mt hier eine juden-christliche Quelle benutzt hat."

has used both feeding miracles as demonstrations of Jesus' compassion on the people. In both instances it is important to note that Matthew has preceded the feeding miracle by a reference to Jesus' customary healing of the sick (14:14 and 15:30f.). Jesus is clearly pictured as the One who is concerned about the physical needs of men and women--he heals the lame, the maimed, the blind and the dumb (v.30) and feeds the hungry (vv.32ff.). Perhaps by means of the words οὐ θέλω in v.32 Matthew has sought to emphasize that Jesus is directly concerned about the welfare of the crowd and does not intend to send them away in their weakened condition.<sup>1</sup> The οὐ θέλω accents the authority of Jesus in this situation.<sup>2</sup>

Both Held<sup>3</sup> and van Iersel<sup>4</sup> draw attention to the ways in which Matthew has made this second feeding narrative correspond more closely to the first (14:13-21), thereby revealing the connexion of both to the Eucharist. In 15:37f. the first evangelist has deviated considerably from the Markan conclusion to present a closer parallel to 14:20f. This can be seen in his use of πάντες . . . τὸ

---

<sup>1</sup>Here Matthew has altered the conditional sentence found in Mk. 8:3.

<sup>2</sup>Thus Bonnard, pp. 235f., and Allen, p. 171.

<sup>3</sup>Pp. 185-187.

<sup>4</sup>Op. cit., pp. 193f.



περισσεύον . . . οἱ δὲ ἐσθίοντες ἦσαν . . . ἄνδρες χωρὶς γυναικῶν καὶ παιδίων. In this way Matthew has again called attention to the enormity of the miracle itself.

In addition, Matthew has described the disciples' participation in the distribution of the bread with the same words as in 14:19c--ἔδωκεν (15:36--ἐδίδου) τοῖς μαθηταῖς, οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις. Finally, by attaching the references to the fish in v.34 (ὀλίγα ἰχθύδια) and in v.35 (καὶ τοὺς ἰχθύας) to those of the loaves Matthew has been able to eliminate the second blessing and distribution which is in the Markan Gospel. It would appear that at this point he has mentioned the fish out of faithfulness to the Markan account but, nevertheless, has preferred to present the blessing and breaking of the bread and fish as one action. With reason Held sees here a closer correspondence to the Church's Eucharistic celebration than that found in Mark:

. . . the meal of the loaves is placed right in the centre and has attracted to itself the feeding with the fishes. The meaning of this alteration is unmistakable: the miraculous feeding is now more exclusively reported in words which give it a clear accord with the celebration of the Lord's Supper.<sup>1</sup>

Further, van Iersel<sup>2</sup> draws attention to the

---

<sup>1</sup>Pp. 186f.

<sup>2</sup>Op. cit., p. 194.

substitution of the aorist ἔλαβεν (v.36) for Mark's λάβων (Mk. 8:6) as another indication that for Matthew this feeding miracle is linked with the Eucharist--in particular, with the words of institution given in I Cor. 11:24. Although it seems somewhat unwise to postulate a relationship between 15:36 and I Cor. 11:24 on the basis of this one alteration since Matthew might have chosen the aorist form simply for reasons of style, we can confidently conclude that for Matthew, as undoubtedly for Mark before him, this feeding miracle had associations with the Lord's Supper.

Although not nearly so clearly as in 14:13-21, the first evangelist has indicated that the disciples assume a mediating role in the miracle. It would seem, however, that Held<sup>1</sup> has developed a stronger case for Matthew's interest in the theme of discipleship in this narrative than can be justified on the basis of 15:32-39 alone. For example, both Held and van Iersel<sup>2</sup> attach significance to the word ἡμῶν which occurs in the Matthean rendering of the disciples' query to Jesus concerning bread in the desert. Matthew has altered the words ὅτι πόθεν τοῦ-  
τους δυνήσεται τις ὧδε χορτάσαι ἄρτων ἐκ' ἐρημίας (Mk. 8:4) to

---

<sup>1</sup>P. 185.

<sup>2</sup>Op. cit., p. 194.

read κόθεν ἡμῖν ἐν ἐρημίᾳ ἄρτοι τοσοῦτοι ὥστε χορτάσαι ὄχλον τοσοῦτον (v.33), and this has led Held to say:

By a small idiosyncrasy [ἡμῖν] Matthew also shows that the disciples regard the feeding as impossible, but nevertheless in principle as their task.<sup>1</sup>

Held is definitely inclined to see more significance in this one word than would normally be seen, since he includes the two feeding narratives under his general theme of discipleship. Although Matthew has here emphasized the role of the disciples, this theme has not been developed to the same extent as in the first feeding story. Perhaps this can be explained on the basis of Matthew's general faithfulness to the Markan material which here did not lend itself so readily to such extensive alterations.

In conclusion, it can be said that Matthew has employed 15:32-39, like 14:13-21, as a demonstration of the character of Jesus' Messiahship. By prefacing the feeding with Jesus' healings in each case, Matthew has highlighted a major thrust of Jesus' ministry--he answers the physical needs of the people in the crowd. In addition, we have observed that Matthew has probably again associated the feeding with the celebration of the Lord's

---

<sup>1</sup>P. 185.

Supper and, at least to some degree, has stressed the participation of the disciples.

The Healing of the Epileptic Child--  
Mt. 17:14-20 (Mk. 9:14-29; Lk. 9:37-43a)

We have already observed that Mk. 9:14-29 is centred around the two-sided theme of faith and unbelief,<sup>1</sup> and we now must evaluate how Matthew's radical abridgement has altered this Markan emphasis.<sup>2</sup> The following should be noted regarding Matthew's handling of the Markan story:

(a) Although the crowd, including the scribes who are debating with the disciples, plays a rather important part in the Markan account (Mk. 9:14-17,25), Matthew has only made a passing reference to it (v.14a).

(b) In Mark the father addresses Jesus as διδάσκαλε, but in Matthew he both kneels (γονυκεῶν)<sup>3</sup> and speaks the words κύριε, ἐλέησόν μου τὸν υἱόν. By means of this alteration, the first evangelist has highlighted both the dignity of Jesus and the worshipful attitude of the father.

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. above, pp. 106-113.

<sup>2</sup>We assume with Bonnard, p. 259, and Held, pp. 188f., that Matthew has here abbreviated Mark and then has inserted the logium in v.20.

<sup>3</sup>Although γονυκεῖν is employed by Matthew here and in 27:29 (cf. also Mk. 1:40, 10:17), he has more frequently used the word προσκυνεῖν to describe this act (cf. 8:2; 9:18; 14:33; 15:25; 20:20; 28:9; 28:17).

(c) Matthew has included only one description of the boy's illness, not two as in the second Gospel (Mk. 9:17b,18a and 9:21b,22a), and has used the word *σεληνιάζεται* (v.15)<sup>1</sup> to explain it.

(d) He has eliminated Jesus' words to the unclean spirit in Mk. 9:25b as well as the death-resurrection motif in Mk. 9:26f. and has briefly reported Jesus' rebuke of the demon and the resultant healing of the child (v.18).<sup>2</sup>

(e) He has retained the section in which the father explains how he brought his child to the disciples and they were unable to heal him (cf. v.16 with Mk. 9:18b).

(f) He has repeated the words of Jesus' indictment against the unbelieving generation (cf. v.17 with Mk. 9:19).

(g) He has expanded the Markan conclusion, which relates the inquiry of the disciples regarding their inability to cast out the demon, by adding the saying about faith (v.20).<sup>3</sup>

It can be seen that Matthew has preserved those sections in the Markan narrative--except for Mk. 9:21-24, where the conversation between Jesus and the father is reported--which contribute in some way to the theme of faith. If Matthew were interested in this general theme,

---

<sup>1</sup>This word appears in Matthew twice--here and in 4:24.

<sup>2</sup>As elsewhere (9:22; 15:28; cf. also 8:13), Matthew has noted the immediacy of the cure by means of the words *ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης*.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Lohmeyer, *Matthäus*, pp. 271-273, for an analysis of this faith-saying as it appears in 17:20; 21:21; Lk. 17:6 and Mk. 11:22f. Cf. also Kilpatrick, pp. 87f. Presumably v.21 is a later addition to this pericope.



it is not immediately obvious why he has omitted the significant words of the father in Mk. 9:24, πιστεύω σοῦθε: μου τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ, since they especially reveal the tension between faith and unbelief. Held<sup>1</sup> suggests that the first evangelist has eliminated the striking scene involving Jesus and the father because he was principally interested in the disciples and their failure to heal the boy. As another answer to this question, Lohmeyer<sup>2</sup> concludes that Matthew had to eliminate Mk. 9:21-24 since this conversation depicting the development of the father's faith is inappropriate in the light of his initial portrayal of the man as one who believes in the power of Jesus.

In either case, it is evident that Matthew was not primarily interested in the faith of the father. Rather, he has moved directly from Jesus' statement in v.17 to an abbreviated form of the announcement of the child's cure (v.18), all of which brings the reader swiftly to the scene between Jesus and his disciples.<sup>3</sup>

In the light of the above, Held correctly concludes that Matthew has centred the entire story around the

---

<sup>1</sup>Pp. 188f.

<sup>2</sup>Matthäus, p. 270.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Held, p. 189.

theme of discipleship, viz, the reason for the disciples' inability to cure the child, and has used δύνασθαι as a convenient connecting word:

There is no question that by this abbreviation [the omission of Mk. 9:21-24] a thoroughly transparent story, the sole theme of which is the failure of the disciples, has taken the place of Mark's complicated picture. This theme of the disciples' failure is expressed shortly and clearly by the father of the sick boy (Matt. 17:16): οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν αὐτὸν θεραπεῦσαι -- this is taken up again by the disciples as a kind of catchword in their question to Jesus (Matt. 17:19): διὰ τί ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἠδυνήθημεν ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτό-- and finally it is clarified by Jesus in the conclusion (Matt. 17:20): καὶ οὐδὲν ἄδυνατόν ἐστι ὑμῖν. This link-up by the catchword is the work of the evangelist himself (in Matt. 17:16,20). And further it has not a merely formal meaning in the sense of linking more closely the miracle story and the closing conversation; it indicates the actual theme.<sup>1</sup>

Already in 10:1 the first evangelist has reported that the disciples had been given authority by Jesus to cast out the unclean spirits, and now in this instance they are shown as being unable to carry out this commission. Although this story probably echoes the experience of the earliest disciples, it seems likely that it has been tailored to answer the questions of those in the Matthean congregation who failed in their attempts at healing.

---

<sup>1</sup>Pp. 188f.

Before we conclude, we need to consider the words of Jesus in v.17.<sup>1</sup> In Mark these words characterize not only the failure of the disciples but also the unbelief of the father and the crowd as the plural αὐτοῖς indicates. In Matthew, however, it seems less likely that either the crowd or the father are meant to be the ones specifically indicted by Jesus' words since the crowd is only incidentally mentioned in v.14a and the father is portrayed as one who from the outset of the story trusts in Jesus' power to help. Held,<sup>2</sup> therefore, deduces that Matthew has intended v.17 to be directed solely against the disciples and has interpreted it in the sense of "little faith" (cf. v.20).

Since, as even Held acknowledges, the word γαρά is not used in either Mark or Matthew to refer to the disciples and since the first evangelist has consistently characterized the condition of the disciples in terms of "little faith" (cf. 8:26; 14:31; 16:8; 6:30) and not complete absence of faith, we hesitate to accept

---

<sup>1</sup>The agreement between v.17 and Lk. 9:41 over against Mark, especially the καὶ διστραμμένη, could either be the result of their independent redaction or their common knowledge of this saying in a form different from that in Mark.

<sup>2</sup>Pp. 191f.

this conclusion. Held's argument would be more consistent if he were prepared to accept the variant reading for ὀλιγοπιστίαν in v.20--ἄπιστος--which the following manuscripts contain: C R D p<sup>m</sup> latt syr<sup>s</sup>.<sup>1</sup> Held,<sup>2</sup> however, retains the more reliable reading ὀλιγοπιστίαν<sup>3</sup> and somewhat artificially interprets the ἄπιστος in v.17 by means of the ὀλιγοπιστίαν in v.20. It seems more reasonable to conclude that in v.17 Matthew has followed tradition by using this saying of Jesus<sup>4</sup> and does not intend it as a deliberate and exclusive reference to the disciples. Admittedly, the disciples are seen as members of a faithless and perverted generation, but it is to be remembered that elsewhere in the first Gospel they are pictured in a much more favourable light than in Mark.

As in Mark this miracle story occurs in the section in which Matthew has been specifically concerned with Jesus' teaching of his disciples. We have

---

<sup>1</sup>Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 271, accepts this variant reading.

<sup>2</sup>Pp. 191f.

<sup>3</sup>ὀλιγοπιστίαν is read in both B and S and is to be preferred since ἀπιστίαν is probably a scribal attempt at harmonization with v.17.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Strecker, p. 233.

observed the ways in which he has effectively consolidated this miracle story around the theme of discipleship. In particular, by his addition of v.20 Matthew has stressed that, during Jesus' earthly ministry and undoubtedly at the time of Matthew, disciples receive power to work miracles if they exhibit faith. Matthew's alteration of the Markan narrative has diminished the emphasis on the exorcism itself and has created more of a story of healing<sup>1</sup> designed to teach those in the Matthean congregation.

The Temple Tax and the Coin in the Mouth  
of the Fish--Mt. 17:24-27

This pericope presents another of the special Petrine incidents peculiar to the first Gospel (cf. 14:28-31; 16:17-19; 18:21f.). Since this story in its present form contains a feature which is sometimes labelled as miraculous (v.27),<sup>2</sup> we must determine whether

---

<sup>1</sup>It should be noted that Matthew has used *θεραπεύειν* in v.18 as well as in the father's statement in v.16. Although this pericope cannot really be classified as a pronouncement story, according to Bultmann, *History*, p. 61, it is " . . . something very like an apophthegm."

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Schniewind, *Matthäus*, p. 196, and McNeile, p. 259. It should be noted, however, that Held does not include 17:24-27 in his consideration of the Matthean miracle stories.



or not it contributes anything to our understanding of the Matthean miracle stories.

The "coin in the mouth of the fish" aspect of the story has on occasions been interpreted to mean that Jesus intends that Peter should catch a fish and then sell it in order to obtain the necessary money for the temple tax.<sup>1</sup> Other interpreters<sup>2</sup> have expended much ingenuity in their attempts to rationalize this feature. All this is unnecessary if, as Kilpatrick<sup>3</sup> suggests, v.27 was not originally part of the pronouncement story. He thinks that this story has passed through a considerable formative process in the pre-Matthean tradition. According to him, v.27 was added after 70 A.D. in order that Christians give no offence to the Roman officials.<sup>4</sup> Since certain words which are characteristic of Matthew's composition appear in this pericope, Kilpatrick supposes that Matthew was possibly the first to put the

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Klostermann, Matthäus, p. 147, and G. M. Lee, "Studies in Texts: Matthew 17:24-27," Theology, 68 (1965), pp. 380f.

<sup>2</sup>Cf., e.g., J. D. M. Derrett, "Peter's Penny: Fresh Light on Matthew XVII 24-7," N.T., 6 (1963), pp. 11ff.

<sup>3</sup>Pp. 41f.

<sup>4</sup>Bonnard, p. 264, also suggests that Matthew has possibly widened the original story to apply it to the Christian's responsibility to submit to political taxation in general.

whole of this story into writing.<sup>1</sup>

Although it is impossible to determine exactly what of this episode is the original core and if v.27 became attached to the story prior to its coming to Matthew, it seems reasonably certain that the "coin in the mouth of the fish" is a legendary feature similar to those known and used in ancient story telling.<sup>2</sup>

If the above description is at all close to that which actually took place in the history of this pericope, then 17:24-27 represents a pronouncement story which is in the process of becoming a miracle story.<sup>3</sup> It seems likely that the reverse process--a miracle story taking on the characteristics of a pronouncement story (cf. Mk. 2:1-12 and 3:1-6)--did occur in the tradition, but there is also evidence that a straightforward incident or saying could take on miraculous elements.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Strecker, pp. 200f., also thinks that here Matthew was dealing with oral tradition.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. H. Montefiore, "Jesus and the Temple Tax," N.T.S., 11 (1964-65), p. 66.

<sup>3</sup>Dodd, Hist. Tradition, p. 227, makes this same observation.

<sup>4</sup>The withering of the fig tree in Mk. 11:12-14, 20f. is probably the result of such a development.

It must be allowed that Jesus' reference to the coin in the fish's mouth (v.27), like his command to the two disciples to fetch the animals for his entry into Jerusalem (cf. 21:2f.), might have been understood by Matthew as an example of Jesus' foreknowledge. In any case, v.27 does not contain a full-fledged miracle of Jesus.<sup>1</sup>

Undoubtedly, Matthew has incorporated the whole of 17:24-27 at this point in his Gospel because it would have been valuable for teaching the early Christians<sup>2</sup> and not because of the hint of the miraculous in v.27. Nevertheless, as the story now stands in Matthew, v.27 is essential to its meaning since it implies that "the sons of the Kingdom" should pay the required tax in order not to present a stumbling block to others. It is possible that earlier in its history the essential content of vv.24-26 simply ended with Jesus' instruction to his followers that they should pay the tax even

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Richardson, p. 107, and T. H. Robinson, p. 150.

<sup>2</sup>Matthew has inserted this episode directly after Jesus' prediction of his Passion and before chapter 18, in which he has grouped teaching pericopae for the benefit of the Church. Cf. Montefiore, op. cit., pp. 60-71, for a consideration of the meaning of this pericope as instruction for the Matthean congregation. See also Bonnard, pp. 264-266.

though they were, in fact, free from the obligation. Now, however, this teaching is closely connected with Jesus' reference to the coin in the mouth of the fish and suggests that this One who submits to the tax regulation is nonetheless " . . . le maître de toutes choses."<sup>1</sup>

The Healing of the Two Blind Men--  
Mt. 20:29-34 (Mk. 10:46-52;  
Lk. 18:35-43)

In each of the Synoptic Gospels this story is reported as the final healing miracle of Jesus, and in both Mark and Matthew it directly precedes Jesus' entry into Jerusalem. There appears to be no reason why we should accept Lohmeyer's conclusion<sup>2</sup> that Matthew has in this instance employed a different version of the story from that in Mark since there are numerous correspondences between the Markan and the Matthean accounts and the differences can best be attributed to the redaction of the first evangelist.

We have already observed that the Markan account is centred around the theme of faith, climaxing in the saying in Mk. 10:52: "Go your way; your faith has saved you."<sup>3</sup> It is striking to note that Matthew, who has

---

<sup>1</sup>Bonnard, p. 266.

<sup>2</sup>Matthäus, pp. 292f.

<sup>3</sup>See above, pp. 113-120.

elsewhere shown definite interest in the theme of faith (cf. 8:10,13; 9:22; 9:29; 15:28), has here eliminated the faith-saying (cf. 20:34 with Mk. 10:52). No doubt, the first evangelist accepted the cries of the two blind men (vv.30f.) and their response to Jesus' question (v.33) as demonstrations of their seeking faith, but it is, nonetheless, obvious that he has not sought to highlight this theme as he has already done in the related story in 9:27-31.<sup>1</sup>

Matthew has not only omitted the saying about faith but also the words in Mark which describe both the mediating action of the crowd (Mk. 10:49b--καὶ φωνοῦσιν τὸν τυφλὸν λέγοντες αὐτῷ θάρσει, ἔγειρε, φωνεῖ σε) and the subsequent enthusiastic reaction of the blind man (Mk. 10:50--ὁ δὲ ἀποβαλὼν τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ ἀνακηδήσας ἦλθεν πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν).<sup>2</sup> Matthew's deletion of these Markan sentences further substantiates the conclusion that the first evangelist was in this instance much less interested in the details about the blind men and their faith than was the second evangelist.

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. above, pp. 188-193, for a consideration of the relationship between 9:27-31 and 20:29-34. It should be noted that Matthew has again spoken of the two blind men, not one as in Mark.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Held, pp. 220f.



For this reason we concur with Held when he says, "The theme of the Matthaean narrative is manifestly not saving faith but the mercy of Jesus towards the blind men, . . . "<sup>1</sup> This change in emphasis is evidenced most clearly in Matthew's reworking of Mk. 10:52. Rather than the words ὑπάγε, ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε he has written σπλαγχνισθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἥψατο τῶν ὀμμάτων<sup>2</sup> αὐτῶν in v.34. In other words, Matthew has preferred to speak of Jesus' compassion and healing touch. In the light of this alteration, it is likely that the question of Jesus in v.32b is intended by Matthew as an indication that Jesus, who is addressed as both "the Son of David" (vv.30,31) and "Lord" (vv.30,31,33) has the power to fulfil their request and not as a device to allow the blind men the opportunity to express their faith as is the case in Mark.<sup>3</sup> Although Matthew has possibly omitted a reference to the compassion of Jesus in 8:3, he has elsewhere stressed that Jesus has pity on the poor and needy (9:36; 14:14; 15:32).

As in the story of the Canaanite woman (15:21-28),

---

<sup>1</sup>p. 221. Cf. further Bonnard, p. 300.

<sup>2</sup>The only other appearance of this word in the New Testament is in Mk. 8:23.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Bonnard, p. 301.

the  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma$  title<sup>1</sup> appears alongside the  $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma \Delta\alpha\upsilon\acute{\iota}\delta$  designation, suggesting that the first evangelist has wanted to picture Jesus not only in terms of his earthly mission but also in terms of his lordship as known and confessed in the Church. Strecker comments on this combination of the two titles with the following words:

Wahrscheinlich ist nun, dass der Zusatz  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma$  zum  $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma \Delta\alpha\upsilon\acute{\iota}\delta$  nicht neutral zu fassen ist, sondern das Bekenntnis zu Jesus als dem Herrn der Gemeinde enthält, nämlich in dieser Zusammenstellung dem eschatologischen Charakter der historisch begrenzten Sendung an Israel Ausdruck gibt.<sup>2</sup>

Like Mark in 9:35-45, in 20:20-28 Matthew has highlighted the crucial difference between the popularly held Messianic expectation of Jesus' day and Jesus' own understanding of his mission--" . . . the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many" (20:28). Further, it should be noted that Matthew has made the connexion between 20:29-34 and the following section more obvious than it

---

<sup>1</sup>It should be noted that  $\chi\rho\iota\varsigma$  in v.30 does not have unusually strong textual support.

<sup>2</sup>P. 124. McNeile, p. 292, is perhaps right in supposing that Matthew has omitted  $\acute{o} \Nu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\alpha\rho\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$  (Mk. 10:47) because of its derogatory implication. In any case, it is not likely that Matthew would have placed  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma$  and this geographically-derived title for Jesus together in the same story.

was in Mark (cf. Mk. 11:10). In the story of the blind men (vv.30f.) and the narratives describing Jesus' entry into Jerusalem (21:9) and into the temple (21:15) Jesus is hailed as "the Son of David." 20:20-28 helps to explain why Jesus is willing to accept this title in both 20:29-34 and 21:1ff.; Jesus is the One who is on his last journey to Jerusalem and will subsequently suffer, but nevertheless he deems it important to stop and serve the needs of these blind men.<sup>1</sup>

We have seen that Matthew has altered this Markan story which principally serves as an illustration of faith and discipleship<sup>2</sup> to present an incident which focuses more directly on Jesus himself, who, acclaimed as the Messianic fulfiller, responds in mercy to the request of the blind men. Such a portrayal of Jesus is Christologically significant in view of the fact that this miracle story introduces the Passion narrative. Jesus, whose ultimate compassion for men is disclosed in his final suffering, exhibits here in the shadow of the cross pity for those who need his assistance.

---

<sup>1</sup>Bonnard, p. 299.

<sup>2</sup>Although the first evangelist has deleted the words ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ (cf. Mk. 10:52), he has reported that the healed man "followed" Jesus (v.34). Cf. above, p. 145, for the note on Matthew's use of the word ἀκολουθεῖν.

The Withering of the Fig Tree--  
Mt. 21:18-22 (Mk. 11:12-14,20-25)

Unlike Luke, Matthew has retained this miracle story which occurs in the second Gospel, but in the process he has altered the order of the Markan narrative. As we have already observed,<sup>1</sup> in the second Gospel the withering of the fig tree has been linked with the account of the cleansing of the temple as a means to bring out symbolically the significance of Jesus' action--just as the fig tree was destroyed on account of its failure to produce fruit so was the temple to be demolished because of the unproductiveness of the nation Israel.

By no longer interlinking these two incidents, the lapse of time between the cursing of the fig tree and its withering (cf. Mk. 11:14,20) is lost, and, as a result, the miraculous drying up of the tree happens at once. According to Matthew, it is on the morning following Jesus' cleansing of the temple that he first notices the fig tree which has only leaves and no fruit. He then declares, "May no fruit ever come from you again!", and thereupon the tree immediately withers

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. above, pp. 120-127, for a consideration of Mk. 11:12-14, 20-25.

(v.19c--καὶ ἐξηράνθη παραχρῆμα.<sup>1</sup> ἡ σὺνχῆ).

We cannot be certain that the first evangelist fully understood Mark's reason for bracketing the account of the temple cleansing with the two-stage episode of the fig tree or, further, if he did understand, that he has deliberately reported the two events separately in order to change this Markan theme. Elsewhere (cf. 8:11f.; 21:41,43; 22:1ff.; 24:14; 27:51,54) Matthew has clearly drawn attention to the fact that the Kingdom is now accessible to the Gentiles because the Jews, in particular their leaders, have refused to accept God's promised salvation embodied in Jesus, the Messiah.<sup>2</sup> However, it should be noted that the first evangelist has for some reason omitted the words *πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν*, which are in the Markan account of the temple cleansing (cf. Mk. 11:17) and would seem to support the Gentile emphasis. Since Matthew was undoubtedly writing after 70 A.D., he probably thought that these words would be unintelligible to his readers who knew that the temple in Jerusalem was no longer standing. The destroyed temple could hardly

---

<sup>1</sup>It is interesting to note that *παραχρῆμα* is a favourite word of Luke and that its appearances in v.19 and v.20 are the only ones outside the third Gospel and the book of Acts in the whole New Testament.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Kilpatrick, pp. 118f.



serve as a house of prayer for all nations.<sup>1</sup> Nonetheless, even this does not necessarily explain why Matthew has not adopted the Markan sequence and used the withering of the fig tree as a poignant anticipation of the fate of Israel.

In any case, by means of this alteration the first evangelist has fashioned a markedly smoother flowing and more coherent story, and it is at least possible that Matthew has done this principally for liturgical reasons.<sup>2</sup> By substituting the words *μίαν ἐπὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ* for *ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἔχουσιν φύλλα* and by omitting the words *εἰ ἄρα τι εὕρησαι ἐν αὐτῇ* Matthew has avoided a repetition of the word *φύλλα* (cf. Mk. 11:13) and has recounted a more logical sequence: Jesus sees the tree along the way; he comes to it; and then he discovers that it has only leaves.<sup>3</sup> After Jesus pronounces the curse on the unproductive fig tree, the tree immediately withers.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 118.

<sup>2</sup>See Kilpatrick, p. 73. Cf. 14:1-12, where the first evangelist has also disrupted another example of the Markan technique of interlocking two episodes (see Mk. 6:7-30).

<sup>3</sup>In addition, Matthew has probably eliminated the Markan phrase *ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς οὐκ ἦν σύκων* (Mk. 11:13) because these words tend to obscure rather than clarify the meaning of the incident. Cf. Klostermann, Matthäus, pp. 168f., for a complete listing of the verbal changes made by Matthew in this pericope.

In Matthew the incident of the fig tree resembles far more closely than in Mark the typical pattern of the miracle story in which the report of the miracle is followed by the amazed reaction of the onlookers. In v.20 the first evangelist has drawn attention to the disciples' amazement<sup>1</sup> and has made the reason for their reaction perfectly obvious by means of their question (πῶς παραχρῆμα ἐξηράνθη ἡ συκῆ) which reports nearly verbatim the notice of the miracle in v.19 (καὶ ἐξηράνθη παραχρῆμα ἡ συκῆ). The disciples are astonished because they have witnessed a miracle.

Held rightly observes that the disciples' question serves another function since in the following two verses (vv.21f.) Matthew has demonstrated interest in the theme of faith:

In that the question [v.20] takes up the conclusion of the miraculous deed of Jesus by means of the catchwords ἐξηράνθη, παραχρῆμα, ἡ συκῆ the present Matthaean context makes completely clear that the cursing of the fig tree was regarded as a genuine miracle story, which along with the added conversation yields a "paradigm for the power of faith".<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Although the verb θαυμάζειν occurs elsewhere in Matthew (cf. 8:10; 8:27; 9:33; 15:31; 22:22; 27:14), this is the only time that it is specifically used to describe the reaction of the disciples.

<sup>2</sup>P. 289.

Although the second evangelist had rather mechanically appended the group of sayings about faith to this story (cf. Mk. 11:22-25), Matthew has carefully reworked the section, joining these sayings more intimately with the previously reported miracle. Not only has he abridged these verses considerably,<sup>1</sup> but he has also brought forward the phrase ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν<sup>2</sup> to be an apt introduction to these statements of Jesus and in the words οὐ μόνον τὸ τῆς συκῆς κοιμήσεται in v.21 has included a reference to the miraculous withering of the fig tree. It is evident that the first evangelist has consciously coupled the miracle of Jesus with the greater miracles which the disciples will be able to effect by faith. If they have faith and do not doubt,<sup>3</sup> they will be able

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew has eliminated both the words ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ ἀλλὰ πιστεύῃ ὅτι ὃ λαλεῖ . . . ἔσται αὐτῷ (Mk. 11:23) and the redundant use of διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν (Mk. 11:24a). In addition, Matthew has probably omitted Mk. 11:25, which connects prayer with the forgiveness of sins, since he has already included a similar saying in a more appropriate context (6:14).

<sup>2</sup>ἀμὴν λέγω . . . is undoubtedly a favourite phrase of Matthew. It occurs more than 30 times in his Gospel compared to thirteen in Mark and six in Luke. The fourth evangelist has added another ἀμὴν (thus ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν) and has employed it about twenty-five times.

<sup>3</sup>Bonnard, p. 309, supposes that the phrase "not to doubt" is intended as an explanation of "to have faith." Καί is explanatory and not additive.

to accomplish the seemingly impossible--the moving of mountains.

Although in Mk. 11:22-25 Jesus responds to Peter's recognition of the fact that the fig tree has withered with a call to faith in God, in light of the previously mentioned changes Matthew has more perceptibly employed this pericope to emphasize the theme of faith--in particular the faith to work miracles. Since by inserting a similar saying about faith Matthew has also highlighted this theme in the story of the healing of the epileptic boy (17:14-21), it seems certain that the first evangelist has intended to demonstrate that the disciples participate in the miraculous power of Jesus. In Matthew the disciples<sup>1</sup> inquire about the sudden withering of the fig tree, but in return " . . . Jesus does not answer with an explanation about his own miraculous power, but with instruction about that of the disciples."<sup>2</sup> In other words, it can be concluded that Matthew was less concerned with the miracle of Jesus per se than with it as a basis for the promise

---

<sup>1</sup>Although Matthew has elsewhere (14:28-31; 17:24-27; 18:21f.) incorporated special Petrine incidents, he has in this instance substituted οἱ μαθηταί for ὁ Πέτρος.

<sup>2</sup>Held, p. 290.

that through faith Jesus' disciples share in his power to work miracles.<sup>1</sup>

We have observed that by carefully rearranging the Markan material Matthew has successfully used this pericope to present a miracle story which illustrates the miraculous power of Jesus now available to his disciples through prayer.<sup>2</sup> Unlike Mark, Matthew's primary interest was not with the incident's symbolic value in regard to the judgement of God on Israel but with the disciples and, undoubtedly, with those who shared in a ministry of power in the early Church.

Summary: Matthew's Use of the Miracle Stories

Although the first evangelist has derived most of his miracle stories from the Markan Gospel, in a few places he has reported new incidents which in

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Schlatter, p. 620, and Lohmeyer, Matthäus, pp. 302f., who draw attention to the story's instruction regarding the power of faith through which disciples share in the work of Jesus. Cf. further, Bonnard, p. 309, who suggests that the phrase οὐ μόνον τὸ τῆς πίστεως κοινῆς has also been intended as an explanation for the absence of miracles in the early Church.

<sup>2</sup>Held, pp. 290f., comments, "Matthew has placed this saying about the unlimited promise to prayer (Matt. 21:22) completely under the question about the possibility of miraculous actions (Matt. 21:20) and understood it as an answer to it in the sense of miracle-working prayer."



some way involve the miraculous. He has supplemented the Markan material by including the story of the centurion (8:5-13) and the healing of a demoniac (12:22-24) from Q; the healing of two blind men (9:27-31) and that of a dumb demoniac (9:32-34), both of which exhibit the marks of his redactional work; the story of the temple tax involving the coin in the mouth of the fish (17:24-27); and the description of the miraculous happenings which accompany the death of Jesus (27:51-53).

In addition, by means of minor insertions or alterations Matthew has sharpened various passages which report Jesus' miracles. He has drawn attention to the immediacy of the cure with the words ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐκείνῃ (8:13) or ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης (9:22; 15:28; 17:18); he has noted that the man's withered hand is as perfect as his other (12:13); he has systematically reported that "all" are healed by Jesus (4:23 and 9:35; cf. 8:16 with Mk. 1:34; 12:15 with Mk. 3:10; 14:35 with Mk. 6:53-56) and has stated that "all" eat and are satisfied in the two feeding narratives (14:20 parallels Mk. 6:42; cf. 15:37 with Mk. 8:8); and he has increased the number of persons fed by including the phrase χωρὶς γυναικῶν καὶ παιδίων (14:21 and 15:38).

Although in the light of these changes it might appear that Matthew was concerned to accentuate the miraculous element in certain stories, we have observed that this is not generally the case. He was not principally interested in the miracles of Jesus for their own sakes. It seems certain that he has inserted 8:5-13, 9:27-31, 9:32-34 and 17:24-27<sup>1</sup> as well as 12:11f., 14:28-31, 15:23f. and 17:20f. because of their usefulness in emphasizing other themes. At first it might seem as though Matthew has heightened the miraculous element in the story of the fig tree in 21:18-20 by reporting the withering of the tree as an immediate occurrence; however, it must be noted that once he had disrupted this story's close connexion with the cleansing of the temple (cf. Mk. 11:12ff.) he was left with no other choice than to record an instantaneous miracle unless he eliminated it altogether.

Further, it seems likely that the first evangelist has included 27:51-53 not to emphasize the miraculous but to provide a confirmation for the Church's belief that by his Resurrection Jesus became " . . .

---

<sup>1</sup>There is no reason to suppose that the first evangelist was responsible for the legendary feature in v.27.

the first-born from the dead" (thus Col. 1:18; cf. also I Cor. 15:20ff.). The words μετὰ τὴν ἔγερσιν αὐτοῦ in v.53 suggest that the resurrection of the saints from their tombs is to be linked not so much with Jesus' death but primarily with his Resurrection.<sup>1</sup> Thus, Matthew has incorporated 27:51-53 for a doctrinal reason.

It has sometimes been suggested that Matthew has eliminated the stories in Mk. 7:31-37 and Mk. 8:22-26<sup>2</sup> because he wanted to avoid their particularly crass picture of Jesus as a wonder worker.<sup>3</sup> Although Matthew might not have completely agreed with the presentation of Jesus in these stories, Held<sup>4</sup> rightly claims that this fact alone does not account for their omission since Matthew has elsewhere used narratives which are similar to these (cf. 8:28-34 with Mk. 5:1-20;

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. K. Stendahl, The Scrolls and the New Testament (London, 1958), p. 15, who draws attention to this matter.

<sup>2</sup>Although Matthew has omitted these two Markan stories, there are possible traces of Mk. 7:31-37 in the summary in 15:29-31 (cf. Taylor, Mark, p. 354, and Haenchen, Der Weg, p. 291) and of Mk. 8:22-26 in the use of the word ὁματὰ and the reference to Jesus' healing touch in the story of the two blind men in 20:29-34.

<sup>3</sup>Cf., e.g., Taylor, Mark, pp. 352, 369, and Richardson, p. 83.

<sup>4</sup>Pp. 207-211.

9:20-22 with Mk. 5:25-34). Instead, according to Held,<sup>1</sup> there are more important reasons why Matthew has not edited Mk. 7:31-37 and Mk. 8:22-26 and used them in his Gospel. In the first place, Matthew has not seen in them the symbolic meaning of the opening of the ears and eyes of the disciples which Mark did; secondly, they do not contain the necessary features which he could have employed to present one of his favourite themes--e.g., Christology or faith.

It does not seem justifiable, therefore, to conclude that Matthew has retained Markan stories simply because they depict miracles performed by Jesus.<sup>2</sup> For him, the stories had to be useful to convey other

---

<sup>1</sup>Pp. 209f.

<sup>2</sup>Perhaps there is a quite simple reason behind Matthew's omission of Mk. 1:23-28. Since Matthew has used Mk. 1:22 in 7:28f. to describe the people's reaction to the authoritative teaching of Jesus, he would probably not have placed this exorcism narrative among the events taking place in Capernaum (cf. Mk. 1:21) in the early part of chapter 8 unless he had eliminated both Mk. 1:22 and the subsequent reference to Jesus' teaching in Mk. 1:27a. Without v.22 and v.27a the narrative would report only Jesus' encounter with the demoniac, the demon's recognition of Jesus, Jesus' rebuke of the demon and the spreading of Jesus' fame throughout Galilee. In view of Matthew's lack of emphasis on Jesus' conflict with the demons and in view of the fact that he has presented an abbreviated version of the other Markan exorcism story in 8:28-34 as a prelude to 10:1,8, it seems probable that Mk. 1:21-28 minus its reference to the authority of

themes. As we have seen, he has consistently adapted the Markan stories to stress theological themes which would have been instructive for the early Christians.

Although in at least three instances (8:18-27; 14:22-33; 15:21-28)<sup>1</sup> Matthew has inserted new material into the miracle story which he had before him in order to interpret it, it is more characteristic of him to abbreviate his source (cf. esp. 8:1-4; 8:28-34; 9:1-8; 9:18-26; 14:13-21; 17:14-21 and 20:29-34 with their Markan parallels). Undoubtedly, he has eliminated details which he considered non-essential to the real meaning of the stories. Often by omitting references to the disciples or other persons he has drawn the attention of the reader more sharply to Jesus and the other principal actor in the story--e.g., the sick person (cf. e.g., 8:14f.; 8:28-34; 9:2-8). He has frequently accented Jesus' encounter with the other person by developing the element of conversation (cf., e.g., 8:1-4; 8:5-13; 8:23-27; 12:9-14; 14:13-21;

---

Jesus' teaching would not have interested Matthew. Cf. W. D. Davies, The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount (Cambridge, 1964), p. 100.

<sup>1</sup>It is possible that Matthew has also expanded the story of the centurion by adding 8:11f. since this saying occurs elsewhere in the third Gospel (Lk. 13:28f.).



15:21-28). Further, the fact that certain stereotyped phrases (e.g., ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἑκείνης in 9:22; 15:28 and 17:18; cf. also 8:13) and catchwords (cf., e.g., καθαρίζειν in 8:3,4 and ἐξουσία in 9:6,8) occur is evidence that Matthew has carefully edited his source material.<sup>1</sup>

It cannot be maintained that Matthew has been unfaithful to the Markan tradition since the themes which he has elucidated by his redaction are already present, if less clearly, in Mark. Rather, he has so ordered these stories that their principal theological themes become obvious and more immediately relevant for the Church in the final ten or twenty years of the first century. We now turn to the miracle stories which have been used by Matthew as illustrations of Christological themes.

Far more frequently than in Mark the first evangelist has depicted Jesus in terms of his post-Resurrection Lordship. In a number of the miracle stories Jesus is addressed as κύριος (8:2; 8:6,8; 8:25; 9:28; 14:28,30; 15:22,25,27; 17:15; 20:30,31); he is revered

---

<sup>1</sup>For a much fuller discussion of these formal characteristics in the Matthean miracle stories, see Held, pp. 211-239.

(προσχυνεῖν) by those who seek healing for themselves or their loved ones (8:2; 9:18; 15:25) and by those who witness his miraculous power (14:33); and quite generally he is pictured in a more exalted manner than in Mark (cf. 8:3 with Mk. 1:43; 12:12 with Mk. 3:5; 9:21 with Mk. 5:28-32; 14:17 with Mk. 6:38; 17:17 with Mk. 9:21; 21:9 with Mk. 11:13). Elsewhere in the miracle stories certain other titles are used to designate Jesus. As in Mk. 2:10, the title ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is applied to Jesus in 9:6, and in 8:29 (Mk. 5:7) and 14:33 Jesus is confessed to be "the Son of God." In the light of Matthew's omission of Mk. 1:24 and Mk. 3:11--in which the titles ὁ ἄγιος τοῦ θεοῦ and ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, respectively, are spoken by demons--and his inclusion of the "Son of God" title coming from the mouths of those in the boat in 14:33, it would appear that the first evangelist did not intend to suggest that only the supernatural spirits recognize the divine Sonship of Jesus prior to the Caesarea Philippi incident. Even his followers realize that the One who has control over the waters is "the Son of God" (14:33; cf. also 8:27).

Another Christological title which Matthew has frequently associated with the healing miracles and which stresses the peculiar mission of Jesus to Israel is ὁ υἱὸς

Δαυ.δ.<sup>1</sup> In Mark this title appears only in the story of Bartimaeus (Mk. 10:47,48), but in Matthew it is used not only in the parallel 20:30,31 but also in miracle stories in 9:27, 12:23 and 15:22. Its use in 9:27 (followed by the acclamation of the crowd in 9:33) and in 12:23 demonstrates that for Matthew Jesus' miraculous deeds of healing evidence that he is the Messianic fulfiller of the Old Testament expectation, i.e., "the Son of David."

We have observed that the title, "the Son of David," is coupled with the words ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς in 9:27 and with both the κύριος title and ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς (με) in 15:22 and 20:30,31. Braumann<sup>2</sup> draws attention to these passages as well as to the story of the healing of the epileptic boy, where the first evangelist has eliminated the request of the father for compassion from Jesus (Mk. 9:22--βοήθησον ἡμῖν σπλαγχνισθεὶς ἐφ' ἡμᾶς) and has replaced it at the outset of the story with the words κύριε, ἐλέησόν μου τὸν υἱόν (17:15). Braumann thinks that these are indications of Matthew's interest in the compassion of Jesus. Further, the first evangelist has

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. J. M. Gibbs, "Purpose and Pattern in Matthew's Use of the Title 'Son of David'," N.T.S., 10 (1963-64), pp. 446-464, some of whose conclusions lack cogency.

<sup>2</sup>Thus G. Braumann, "Jesu Erbarmen nach Matthäus," Theologische Zeitschrift, 19 (1963), pp. 307-311.

not only retained the Markan references to Jesus' compassion in connexion with the two feeding miracles (14:14 and 15:32) but also has described in 14:14 healing, not teaching (cf. Mk. 6:34), as the immediate result of Jesus' feeling of pity. Finally, in the healing of the blind men in 20:29-34 Matthew has neglected his favourite theme of faith, introducing instead the word *σπλαγχνισθεῖς* (20:34). Thus to a greater extent than Mark the first evangelist has emphasized the miracles as an expression of Jesus' compassion<sup>1</sup> and has even suggested Old Testament confirmation for this in 9:13 and 12:7.

In addition, it should be noted that after Matthew's alteration certain miracle stories present a more striking picture of Jesus as the Messianic helper who compassionately assists the needy: in 8:1-4 and 8:5-13 Jesus responds to requests of the outcasts from Jewish society and in 8:14f. he sees the need of Peter's mother-in-law and without being asked heals her, all of which fulfil the Old Testament prophecy quoted in 8:17; in 14:13-21 and 15:32-39 he heals and feeds the poor; and, finally, in 20:29-34 just prior to his Passion he has compassion on the blind and grants them sight.

---

<sup>1</sup>It is not at all certain that Matthew has omitted a reference to Jesus' compassion in 8:3 since the original reading in Mk. 1:41 might in fact have been *ὀργισθεῖς*.

The first evangelist has utilized certain miracle stories to bring out clearly other specific Christological themes which would have been instructive for the early Church: Jesus' attitude towards the law (8:1-4), his teaching regarding the observance of the sabbath (12:9-14), a confirmation of his authority to forgive sins (9:1-8), and a demonstration of his authority over the evil spirits in anticipation of the final day of judgement (8:28-34, cf. esp. *πρὸ καιρὸς* in v.29). In addition, both 9:32-34 and 12:22-24, which are by no means full-fledged miracle stories, have evidently been introduced by Matthew to draw attention to the Christological significance of Jesus' deeds of healing and exorcisms.

Not only has Matthew used the miracle stories to teach Christological truth but he has also employed them to convey certain other themes pertinent to the life of the Church. He has frequently highlighted the theme of faith: in 9:18-26 the faith of the ruler and of the woman with the haemorrhage, in 9:27-31 the faith of the two blind men, and in 8:5-13 and 15:21-28 the faith of Gentiles. Undoubtedly, these last two stories were intended by Matthew to provide guidance in settling the question about the place of the Gentiles in the Church.



Closely linked with the theme of faith is that of discipleship, and the first evangelist has quite carefully developed this latter concept. He has portrayed the disciples in a much more favourable light than Mark: although they still experience fear (8:26; 14:26f.,30) and have doubts (14:31; 21:21), they do give evidence of faith. Matthew's characteristic use of the word ὀλιγόπιστος / ὀλιγοπιστία (8:26; 14:31; 17:20; cf. further 6:30 and 16:8) as well as the cry κύριε, σῶσον (8:26; 14:30) reveals a basic interpretation of discipleship different from that of Mark: disciples are ones who recognize Jesus' divine Sonship (14:33); they attempt obediently to follow Jesus (8:18-23); they are constantly perplexed because of their little faith; and they must continually call upon the Lord for help.

Finally, Matthew has obviously used certain miracle stories to indicate how the disciples, and thus those in the early Church, share in the prerogatives of the Lord Jesus and are commissioned by him to participate in his work. By faith they are to share his authority over the natural forces (14:28-31), by faith they are to cast out demons (17:19f.) and work great miracles (21:21f.),<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>It is interesting to note that although in 10:1 and 10:8 the disciples are commissioned by Jesus to cast out demons and heal the sick, the final great

they are to have the authority on earth to forgive sins (9:8), and they are to serve as intermediaries in the administration of the Eucharist (14:13-21; 15:32-39).

It is, of course, true that most of the above themes appear elsewhere in the first Gospel, but it is noteworthy that Matthew has effectively used the miracle stories to develop these ideas. In addition to the pericopae which report a specific miracle of Jesus we must comment upon the various summary sections which recount healings of Jesus in order to gain a fuller understanding of the meaning of "miracle" in the Gospel of Matthew.

Mark has viewed Jesus' power over the evil spirits not only as a function essential to his ministry but also as one which is to be differentiated from that of healing. As a comparison of certain summary passages demonstrates, Matthew has tended to disregard this distinction between the two. Undoubtedly, for Matthew 4:23 sets out the programme of Jesus' ministry; he teaches, preaches and heals:

---

commission in 28:19f. makes no mention of a healing ministry. There the disciples are commissioned to teach. Stendahl, The School of St. Matthew, p. 22, notes that in Matthew teaching is stated as the task of the disciples while in Mark this is only assumed.

καὶ περιῆγεν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ  
διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν  
καὶ κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας  
καὶ θεραπεύων πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν ἐν τῷ λαῷ

In the next verse (v.24) he has stated that all sorts of diseased persons are brought to Jesus, and he heals them (καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτούς). It is noteworthy that the demoniacs (v.24--δαιμονιζομένους) are among those listed here and that Matthew has allowed the verb θεραπεύειν to include their cure also. In other words, the first evangelist has neither used the verb ἐκβάλλειν to describe the exorcism of the demons nor has he supposed that the demoniacs form a special category over against the rest of those whom Jesus heals. This difference in emphasis is clearly seen when we note the Markan summary passage which in this instance Matthew has altered: Mk. 1:39 sums up Jesus' ministry in Galilee exclusively in terms of his preaching and casting out of demons--

καὶ ἦλθεν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν  
εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλων.

When we compare 12:15 with Mk. 3:7-12, we discover a similar pattern. In this Markan summary which comes after the sabbath controversy story (Mk. 3:1-6) the fact that Jesus heals many (πολλούς) stands alongside his rebuke of the unclean spirits who recognize him as the Son of God. Although in 12:15 the first evangelist

has reported that Jesus heals all (πάντας)<sup>1</sup> who come to him, he applies the rebuke of Jesus to those who are healed by him and not to demons who recognize Jesus' divinity. By omitting the reference to the demons, Matthew has again shown little interest in Jesus' authority over them; instead, he has stressed that Jesus does not wish to use his healing to gain publicity.<sup>2</sup>

Finally, it should be noted that in 8:16f. Matthew has retained the Markan reference (Mk. 1:32-34) to Jesus' casting out of demons but has interpreted it in the light of Is. 53:4. Since the first evangelist has inverted the Markan order (cf. 8:16 with Mk. 1:34), it seems likely that he has intended the words ἀσθενείας and νόσους in v.17 to correspond respectively to the casting out of demons and the healing of the sick. It would appear, therefore, that Matthew has kept this Markan differentiation between Jesus' healing and exorcisms to provide a parallel for these two words which

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew has also substituted πάντας for πολλούς in 8:16 (cf. Mk. 1:34).

<sup>2</sup>It is to be noted that Matthew has employed the Isaianic passage in 12:18-21 to establish this point. Cf. Stendahl, The School of St. Matthew, pp. 107ff., and Strecker, pp. 67-70.

are rather general in meaning.<sup>1</sup> It should be concluded, therefore, that Jesus' authority over the demons plays a less important role in Matthew than in Mark<sup>2</sup> with the first evangelist portraying Jesus' casting out of demons as only a part of his general ministry of healing.

The fact that the word θεραπεύειν occurs sixteen times in Matthew as compared to only five times in the second Gospel indicates how significant Jesus' healing ministry was for the first evangelist. Not only does the word regularly appear in the Matthean summaries (cf. 4:23f; 8:16; 9:35; 12:15; 15:30) but it is noteworthy that it has been substituted twice for a Markan reference to the teaching of Jesus (cf. 14:14 with Mk. 6:34; 19:2 with Mk. 10:1) and once it has been added to a narrative (21:4).

---

<sup>1</sup>Although ἁσθενεία occurs only here in Matthew, the verb ἁσθενέειν is used in 10:8, 25:36 and 25:39. Cf. 4:23, 24; 9:35; and 10:1 for other appearances of νόσος in the first Gospel.

<sup>2</sup>We arrive at the same conclusion when we compare the Matthean and Markan passages which describe the commission given to the disciples. In Mk. 6:7 the disciples are given authority over the unclean spirits (καὶ ἐδίδου αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν πνευμάτων τῶν ἀκαθάρτων), but in 10:1 the first evangelist has included as part of their commission the authority to heal (ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων ὥστε ἐκβάλλειν αὐτά, καὶ θεραπεύειν πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν). In 10:8 Matthew has again mentioned the casting out of demons but it is just one of the functions of the disciples.



In Matthew the healing miracles of Jesus in conjunction with his teaching<sup>1</sup> stand as signs of the presence of the Kingdom. Matthew has made this evident both by means of his choice of material for chapters 8 and 9 and his inclusion of the Christological question of John the Baptist in 11:2-6. As a sequence to Jesus' teaching in chapters 5-7, Matthew has brought together in chapters 8 and 9 more than half of the miracle stories.<sup>2</sup> Chapters 5-7 and chapters 8 and 9 present

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Strecker, pp. 175-177, who observes the ways in which Matthew has closely connected the "Wort und Wunder" of Jesus.

<sup>2</sup>Ten miracles are included in 8:1-9:34 if the raising of the ruler's daughter (9:18f., 23-26) and the healing of the woman with the issue of blood (9:20-22) are counted separately. It would appear that Matthew has carefully arranged chapters 8-9 since he has not only re-ordered the Markan material but also has inserted a story from Q (8:5-13), omitted a Markan exorcism narrative (Mk. 1:23-28) and added two pericopae which have no direct parallels in Mark (9:27-31; 9:32-34). It is possible that he has placed in succession the healing of the leper (8:1-4), the story of the centurion (8:5-13) and the healing of Peter's mother-in-law (8:14f.) since in each instance Jesus is pictured assisting a person who does not possess full rights in the Jewish religious community (so Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 153). In addition, it seems likely that the first evangelist has delayed the pericopae in Mk. 2:23-3:35 until chapter 12 because he has felt that these stories would fit less appropriately in a section of miracle stories. It is noteworthy that the healing of the man with the withered hand is among these stories (Mk. 3:1-6). If the first evangelist has deliberately reported ten miracles of Jesus in

sections in which Jesus respectively teaches and acts with divine authority (cf. 7:28 and 9:33). These two sections illustrate in detail the programme of Jesus' ministry which is first set forth in 4:23 and then reiterated in 9:35--διδάσκων and κηρύσσων stand alongside θεραπεύων.

The miracles reported in chapters 8 and 9--giving

---

chapters 8-9, why has he done so? Davies, The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount, pp. 86-93, in his discussion concerning the "new Exodus and new Moses" theme in Matthew refers to H. J. Schoeps, Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums (1948), p. 93, who concludes that these ten miracles are intended as counterparts to the ten plagues at the first Exodus. Davies rejects Allen's suggestion (p. 94) that there are only nine miracles and agrees with Schoeps that we must count ten. Nevertheless, contrary to Schoeps, he concludes that there is little evidence in chapters 8-9 to suggest that the ten miracles are meant to parallel the ten plagues. Cf. Bacon, Studies in Matthew, pp. 187-189, who also denies this association with the ten plagues, but he does so on the basis of less cogent reasoning. Davies' suggestion that the number ten "may be a mere literary convenience" (p. 90) might be supported by Strecker's observation (pp. 38f.) that Matthew has characteristically employed round numbers. Although Strecker does list the ten miracles among his examples of this Matthean trait, it must be remembered that in light of his thesis that the first evangelist was not a Jewish-Christian Strecker would not be predisposed to accept the possibility that Matthew has fashioned chapters 5-7 and 8-9 to portray Jesus as the "new Moses" (cf. Strecker, pp. 147f.). In the light of the juxtaposition of the material in chapters 5-7 and that in 8-9 and the general Jewish flavour of the first Gospel, however, it seems probable that the Moses motif is intended here. Cf. finally, Hahn, p. 400.

sight to the blind (9:27-31), making the lame walk (9:1-8), cleansing the leper (8:1-4), restoring the hearing of the deaf (9:32-34) and raising the dead (9:23-26)--together with the proclamation of the "good news" provide the authentication of Jesus' Messianic mission (thus 11:5). Further, it is clear that Matthew has envisioned these healing miracles as signs of the Kingdom because they are, in fact, in accordance with the Old Testament expectations. Matthew not only has recognized the Isaianic background (Is. 35:5f., 29:18) to the Q passage in 11:5 but has also inserted the quotation from Is. 53:4 in 8:17 as a means of interpreting Jesus' acts of mercy in 8:1-16.

The inclusion of this Old Testament statement suggests that Matthew has not viewed Jesus and his miraculous action in the terms of the Hellenistic θεῖος ἀνὴρ. Held states,

. . . the miraculous deeds obviously in the opinion of the evangelist are not in themselves sufficient proof of the Messianic dignity of Jesus. Only the evidence that through them Scripture, and so the will of God expressed in it, is fulfilled gives them Christological meaning.<sup>1</sup>

Further, Held<sup>2</sup> has shown that the words in 9:13a

---

<sup>1</sup>P. 255.

<sup>2</sup>Pp. 257-259.

ἔλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν (Hos. 6:6) are best understood as another attempt by Matthew to indicate that the deeds of Jesus are in accordance with the Scripture and thus the will of God.

The following can be stated about the manner in which Matthew has interpreted the miracles of Jesus in his Gospel: he has not emphasized Jesus' authority over the demons to the same extent as has Mark but has merely described the exorcisms as a part of Jesus'--and subsequently the disciples'--ministry of healing; Jesus' proclaiming and healing ministries are closely linked in Matthew, and both have Messianic significance; and the miracles of Jesus are Messianic because they are a fulfilment of the Old Testament Scripture.

Thus we have considered Matthew's interpretation of the miracles of Jesus as a whole as well as the way in which he has employed each individual miracle story. The miracles are for Matthew signs of the Messianic age since they stand as fulfilments of the Old Testament Scripture, but, in addition, we have seen that the miracle stories themselves were useful means by which the first evangelist could present various theological themes for the instruction of the Matthean congregation.

### CHAPTER III

#### THE MIRACLE STORIES IN LUKE

##### The Healing of the Demoniac in the Synagogue--Lk. 4:31-37 (Mk. 1:21-28)

Beginning with this exorcism narrative which Matthew has omitted from his Gospel, Luke has recounted the whole series of incidents reported in Mk. 1:21-39. It should be observed, however, that the third evangelist has prefaced this section of material adapted from the Markan source with the special Nazareth-synagogue story (4:16-30) and not with the pericope which describes the call issued by Jesus to the disciples (Mk. 1:16-20).

While Jesus is in his home town synagogue, he is recorded as saying to the people who are scandalized by the fact that he grew up among them, "Doubtless you will quote to me this proverb, 'Physician, heal yourself; what we have heard you did at Capernaum, do here also in your own country'" (4:23). This suggests that Capernaum,<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>In Mark Jesus does not visit Nazareth until 6:1ff. while in Luke he never returns to his home town after this rejection at the outset of his ministry (cf.



not Nazareth, is a setting for Jesus' miracles. Having thus drawn attention to the healings done in Capernaum<sup>1</sup> Luke has appropriately taken up the Markan narrative at 4:31ff. with its setting in this city. Undoubtedly, for Luke 4:31-37 provided a specific demonstration that the programme of salvation announced by Jesus in the synagogue in Nazareth was being fulfilled. The "acceptable year of the Lord" (v.19) had commenced because Jesus, now endowed with the Spirit (v.18a-- πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐκ'

---

4:28-30). In the third Gospel the ministry of Jesus apparently takes place exclusively in Galilee up until 8:26, in which Jesus enters the country of the Gerasenes, and the city of Capernaum plays an important role in Luke's account of this Galilean ministry of Jesus (4:31-9:50). Conzelmann, pp. 38f., insists that Luke, unlike Mark, has not located Capernaum near the lake (cf. 5:27 with Mk. 2:13; the third evangelist has omitted the words πόλιν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν) and from this concludes that Luke did not wish Jesus' Galilean headquarters to be at the border of the region. Although Conzelmann sees no particular significance in the Lukan addition in v.31, πόλιν τῆς Γαλιλαίας, most commentators (Creed, p. 70; Plummer, p. 131; Schmidt, p. 54; Lagrange, *Luc*, p. 148; Loisy, *Évangiles Synoptiques*, vol. 1, p. 448) assume that this explanatory note was for the benefit of Luke's Gentile readers who would have been unfamiliar with Palestinian geography.

<sup>1</sup>Fuller, *Miracles*, pp. 83f., argues on the basis of Luke's use of the future tense ἐπεῖτε in 4:23 that he was stating what the reaction of the people in Nazareth would be once Jesus has embarked upon his programme of healing. It seems more likely, however, that Luke has employed the future tense of the verb because Jesus anticipates that which the people in Nazareth are about to say to him.

ἐμέ . . . ), has begun his work.

Before we consider the manner in which Luke has used this first exorcism narrative, it is necessary to note the Lukan emphasis on the "spirit" (πνεῦμα) and "power" (δύναμις) in the ministry of Jesus. After his Baptism (3:21f.) Jesus returns from the Jordan "full of the Holy Spirit" (4:1-- πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου) to be tempted in the wilderness by the Devil, and then he returns into Galilee "in the power of the Spirit" (4:14-- ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος) to begin his work. By substituting the incident in the Nazareth synagogue, in which Jesus declares that the passage from Isaiah which contains a reference to the "Spirit of the Lord" (4:18) was fulfilled that day, for the announcement of Jesus in Mk. 1:15: "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent, and believe in the gospel,"<sup>1</sup> Luke, unlike Mark and Matthew,<sup>2</sup> has not suggested so explicitly that the ministry of Jesus takes up where that of John the Baptist ended.<sup>3</sup> According to Luke, it

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Creed, pp. 65f.    <sup>2</sup>Cf. Mk. 1:14 and Mt. 4:12.

<sup>3</sup>Already in 3:19f., directly before the account of Jesus' Baptism, Luke has mentioned the imprisonment of John and consequently has eliminated the reference to it in 4:14 (cf. Mk. 1:14). In addition, later in his Gospel (cf. Mk. 6:17-29 and Mt. 14:3-12) the third evangelist has omitted the fuller account which explains the

is not the imprisonment of John which prompts Jesus to initiate his ministry but the compulsion of the Spirit.<sup>1</sup>

In the light of Luke's preoccupation with this theme, his insertion of the words καὶ δυνάμει in v.36 is worth noting. Since the third evangelist has used πνεῦμα and δυνάμει almost interchangeably,<sup>2</sup> it seems evident that in the first exorcism narrative Luke was emphasizing that with the power of the Spirit (see again 4:1 and 4:14) Jesus exercises control over the demons. In 4:5f. Luke alone has suggested that the world was given, at least for a time, into the control of the Devil,<sup>3</sup> and at the conclusion of the Temptation he has declared that the Devil " . . . departed from him [Jesus] until an

---

reason for John's arrest. All this suggests that for Luke the ministry of the Baptist and that of Jesus formed completely separate stages in the history of salvation. The reference to John in 16:16 substantiates this conclusion: "The law and the prophets were until John; since then the good news of the kingdom of God is preached . . . " Cf. Conzelmann, pp. 22-27.

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Leaney, p. 117.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. C. K. Barrett, The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition (London, 1947), pp. 76f., and Conzelmann, pp. 182f.

<sup>3</sup>The Lukan concept at this point is similar to the Johannine designation of Satan as "the ruler of this world" (cf. Jn. 12:31, 14:30, 16:11). In regard to the Temptation by the Devil in 4:5-8 Creed, p. 63, declares: "Instead of displacing him, Jesus is tempted to receive dominion at his hands."

opportune time" (4:13). In the light of the ἄρτι καί ποῦ Conzelmann<sup>1</sup> argues that for Luke the ministry of Jesus, standing at the centre of the redemptive history, was a time free from the Devil. It is at the time of the Passion that Satan returns to the scene (see esp. 22:3). If this is true, then Jesus' authority over the demons in 4:31-37, as indeed in the subsequent exorcism narratives, evidences his victory over Satan who, nevertheless, again has his "hour" during the Passion (22:53b).

It has sometimes been stated that Luke has only altered Mk. 1:21-28 for stylistic reasons,<sup>2</sup> but we have already established that Luke's insertion of the words καὶ δυνάμει in v.36 is not unimportant. It is obvious that the third evangelist has quite faithfully reproduced the sequence of events in this story of the demoniac and has made certain verbal changes merely to clarify the meaning of the narrative. For example, it would seem that Luke has replaced the words ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ (Mk. 1:23b) by ἔχων πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου (v.33) in order to make obvious the relationship between the possessed man and the demon.<sup>3</sup> However, it seems unlikely that the

---

<sup>1</sup>Pp. 27f.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Creed, p. 69.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Lagrange, Luc, p. 149, and Plummer, pp. 132f.

transposition of the words φωνῇ μεγάλῃ (cf. Mk. 1:26 with v.33) and the description of the demon's expulsion from the possessed man (v.35--καὶ ῥῖψαν αὐτὸν τὸ δαιμόνιον εἰς τὸ μέσον ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ μηδὲν βλάψαν αὐτόν)<sup>1</sup> are simply arbitrary deviations from the Markan account. Luke has probably reported that the demon cries out "with a loud voice" (φωνῇ μεγάλῃ) when he first recognizes Jesus to accentuate the authority of Jesus' rebuke. Creed declares, "By this transposition of the great cry Lk. leaves the devil obedient and silent, after the word of command has been uttered."<sup>2</sup> Further, by including the words εἰς τὸ μέσον the third evangelist has possibly sought to provide observable evidence that the demon was cast out,<sup>3</sup> and by means of the words μηδὲν βλάψαν αὐτόν he has heightened the miraculousness of the exorcism.<sup>4</sup>

Luke's references to the authority of "the word" (v.32 and v.36) are more significant than the above alterations. Mark has stated in 1:22 that the people are amazed at the teaching of Jesus " . . . for he taught them as one who had authority, and not as the

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Mk. 1:26.

<sup>2</sup>p. 71.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Loisy, Évangiles Synoptiques, vol. 1, p. 451, and Lagrange, Luc, p. 150.

<sup>4</sup>Thus Creed, p. 70.



scribes," but Luke has changed this to read, " . . . for his word was with authority" (ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ ἦν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ). Then, after the exorcism, Luke has described the crowd's reaction in the following words: τίς ὁ λόγος οὗτος, ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ καὶ δυνάμει ἐπιτάσσει τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις πνεύμασιν καὶ ἐξέρχονται (v.36b; cf. Mk. 1:27b). In v.32 Luke has no longer contrasted the teaching of Jesus with that of the scribes, and in v.36 he has omitted the Markan reference to the teaching. It would appear that the third evangelist was primarily interested to describe "the word" of Jesus and its authority, particularly its power over the demons. Conzelmann states,

In Luke iv, 36 λόγος occurs, in contrast to Mark i, 27. Here there is an essential difference, for to Luke Jesus' authority does not reside in his teaching, but in his power over the spirits, in his word of command.<sup>1</sup>

'Ο λόγος undoubtedly suggested to Luke power and action since he seems to be keenly aware of the dynamic role played by the preached "word of God" in the early Church (cf. 1:2; 5:1; 8:11,12,13,15; 8:21; 11:28; see further the book of Acts).

Thus, it is evident that in 4:31-37 Luke has sharpened the story's picture of Jesus as the One whose

---

<sup>1</sup>p. 222.

word controls the demons and has shown much less concern to emphasize the authority of Jesus' teaching. For Luke this incident verifies that Jesus is the divine Son of God as declared in his Baptism and tested in the Temptation as well as indicating that Jesus, empowered by the Spirit, initiates the Messianic programme announced in Nazareth.

The Healing of Simon's Mother-in-law--  
Lk. 4:38f. (Mk. 1:29-31; Mt. 8:14f.)

Following the Markan order, Luke has indicated that Jesus leaves the synagogue<sup>1</sup> and enters the house of Simon. Like Matthew, the third evangelist has eliminated the names of Andrew, James and John, but it would appear that he has done so for a somewhat different reason. Matthew has probably avoided making reference to these disciples in order to direct the reader's attention exclusively to Jesus, the central figure in the story, while Luke has apparently omitted their names since he has delayed the reporting of the scene of their call until 5:1-11 (cf. also 6:13-16). Although he has included the name of Simon in v.38 (as the owner of the

---

<sup>1</sup>By beginning the pericope with the word ἀναστῆς Luke has assumed that Jesus first has to arise from a seated position before he departs from the synagogue.

house and as the son-in-law of the sick woman), the singular εἰσῆλθεν suggests that Jesus enters unaccompanied.<sup>1</sup> In the light of Luke's substitution of the incident in 5:1-11 for the pericope in Mk. 1:16-20, even the reference to the house of Simon is rather abrupt. There is no suggestion that Luke has intended that the story of the healing of Simon's mother-in-law serve as a prelude to the story in 5:1-11.

Luke's alteration of the Markan description of the woman's sickness and the action of Jesus are far more useful than the above alterations as we seek to understand the way in which the third evangelist has interpreted this story. In the first place, by substituting the words ἦν συνεχομένη κυρετῷ μεγάλῳ (v.38) for κατέκειτο κυρέσσουσα (Mk. 1:30) Luke has intentionally emphasized the severity of the woman's condition. The verb συνέχειν, which is used often by the third evangelist (cf. 8:37; 8:45; 12:50; 19:43; 22:63; Acts 7:57, 18:5, 28:8),<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The appearances of two plural forms, ἡρώτησαν (v.38) and αὐτοῖς (v.39), indicate that either Luke has followed the Markan wording (although it should be noted that he has replaced λέγουσιν by ἡρώτησαν) and has failed to be consistent (thus Lagrange, *Luc*, p. 152) or that by these plural forms he has intended to indicate that other persons were present in Simon's house (cf. Schmidt, pp. 56f.).

<sup>2</sup>The only other appearance of this verb in the Gospels is in Mt. 4:24.

can be rendered "seized" or "tormented" so that Luke is possibly indicating that Simon's mother-in-law is being tormented by a great fever. It is almost as though Luke has personified the fever, viewing it as demonic.

Secondly, this change has prepared the way for Luke's most important alteration of the Markan narrative. In Mk. 1:31a the second evangelist has recounted the healing action of Jesus in the following way: "And he came and took her by the hand and lifted her up" (καὶ προσελθὼν ἤγειρεν αὐτὴν κρατήσας τῆς χειρός). Luke, however, has stated, "And he stood over her and rebuked the fever" (v.39a-- καὶ ἐπιστάς<sup>1</sup> ἐπάνω αὐτῆς ἐπετίμησεν τῷ πυρετῷ). In the light of the fact that the word ἐπιτιμᾶν has just been used in 4:35 and appears again in 4:41, it seems likely that the third evangelist has inserted it into 4:39 for a definite reason. Since in both 4:35 and 4:41 Jesus is reported as "rebuking" (ἐπιτιμᾶν) demons, it follows that Luke has understood Jesus' control over the fever in a similar fashion.<sup>2</sup> Elsewhere

---

<sup>1</sup>Outside the Gospel of Luke and the book of Acts the word ἐπιστάναι occurs only in three verses in the New Testament (I Thess. 5:3; II Tim. 4:2,6). It is employed eighteen times by Luke.

<sup>2</sup>Both Rengstorff, p. 73, and Loisy, Évangiles Synoptiques, vol. 1, p. 455, conclude that 4:38f. is similar to an exorcism narrative.

Luke has endorsed the idea that there is a direct relationship between sickness and the power of Satan (13:11,16), and this would imply that he has here wished to explain the woman's illness in terms of demonic power.

If this is so, then Luke has highlighted both the severity of the woman's condition and her miraculously sudden (καταχρῆμα<sup>1</sup> δὲ ἀναστᾶσα) recovery to demonstrate that here again Jesus is engaged in the same activity as just portrayed in 4:31-37. Jesus is the One who with the power of the Spirit has complete authority over the destructive forces of the kingdom of Satan.

The Healing of the Sick at Evening--  
Lk. 4:40f. (Mk. 1:32-34; Mt. 8:16f.)

Like Mark, Luke has followed the story of the healing of Simon's mother-in-law with the pericope which reports the healings accomplished by Jesus during the evening of that same day. By means of the words δύνοντος δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου (v.40) Luke has preserved the temporal connexion between 4:38f. and 4:40f. (cf. Mk. 1:32), but he has omitted the Markan report of the gathering of the people of the city at the door of Simon's house

---

<sup>1</sup>Luke is the only New Testament writer who has used the word καταχρῆμα with the exception of Matthew in 21:19f. It appears in miracle stories in 5:25; 8:44,47; 8:55; 13:13; 18:43. Cf. further Acts 12:23, 13:11, 16:26.



(Mk. 1:33). Without this reference the passage in Luke tends to serve as a general summary of Jesus' healing to a greater extent than that in Mark.

It is worth noting that the third evangelist has not maintained Mark's clear distinction between Jesus' healing the sick and his casting out of the demons (Mk. 1:34) but has described just one healing action. He has reported that " . . . all those who had any that were sick with various diseases brought them to him; and he laid his hands on every one of them and healed them" (v.40).<sup>1</sup> In this way Luke has not only avoided the ambiguity of Mark, where it is suggested that only some of the sick are healed by Jesus,<sup>2</sup> but has also indicated that by means of one act (the touch of his hands) Jesus is able to heal them. Only the verb *θεραπεύειν* is used by Luke; he no longer employs *ἐκβάλλειν*.

Although the demoniacs are not specifically mentioned in v.40 (cf. Mk. 1:32), it is reported in v.41 that " . . . demons also came out of many, crying, 'You are the Son of God!'" It is obvious that the third evangelist has inserted into v.41 the words which he

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Loisy, Évangiles Synoptiques, vol. 1, p. 457.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. above, pp. 18f.

found in Mk. 3:11 (λέγοντα ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ). Undoubtedly, Luke assumed that this confessional statement spoken by the demons fit this summary passage in 4:41 more aptly than the later context in which he has used certain portions of Mk. 3:7-12 (cf. 6:17-19) to introduce his version of the Sermon on the Mount.

In 1:34 Mark has stated that Jesus prevents the demons from speaking because they know him. In Luke, however, the demons have already declared that Jesus is the Son of God, and, consequently, the third evangelist cannot leave this final Markan phrase unchanged (ὅτι ἤδεισαν αὐτόν). He has expanded it to read ὅτι ἤδεισαν τὸν χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι. It is difficult to know if any significance should be assigned to Luke's use of these two Christological titles in this same context. There is at least the possibility that the third evangelist has intended τὸν χριστὸν to define more closely the meaning of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. It seems certain that Luke has interpreted the title, "the Son of God" in the light of the Temptation narrative in which Jesus' divine Sonship is deliberately challenged by the Devil.<sup>1</sup> Then by adding the χριστός designation he has perhaps wanted to show

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Lagrange, Luc, p. 153.

that Jesus is "the Christ of God" (cf. 9:20) who is anointed with the Spirit and sent to exercise full authority over the powers of sickness and demons.

Thus in 4:40f. the third evangelist has developed more fully the theme which he has already emphasized in the exorcism narrative in 4:31-37 and the story of the healing of Simon's mother-in-law in 4:38f.

The Miraculous Catch of Fish--  
Lk. 5:1-11

We have already observed that the third evangelist has adjusted the Markan order by eliminating Mk. 1:16-20 and by inserting in its place the story about Jesus' preaching in the synagogue in Nazareth. Now in 5:1-11 he has introduced a pericope depicting Simon Peter's experience which results in his decision to follow Jesus. Although the narrative is given over almost entirely to Simon, it should be noted that two other disciples, James and John, are specifically mentioned in v.10. Luke has probably brought James and John into the incident to provide an adequate replacement for Mk. 1:16-20,<sup>1</sup> where these three as well as Andrew are

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Gilmour, I.B., vol. 8, p. 102; Creed, p. 74; Lagrange, Luc, pp. 161f.; and esp. J. A. Bailey, The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John ("Supplement to Novum Testamentum, vol. 7"; Leiden, 1963), p. 15. It should be noted that the promise of

called by Jesus. Undoubtedly, Luke has intended the concluding words " . . . they left everything and followed him" (v.11b) to be a reference to the sons of Zebedee as well as to Simon.

Vv.1-3 exhibit certain similarities to Mk. 4:1f., which are omitted by Luke in 8:4. This suggests that the third evangelist has constructed the introduction for the incident recorded in vv.4-11 or, at least, has made alterations to that which already existed.<sup>1</sup> These verses prepare for what follows by describing the eagerness of the crowd to hear "the word of God"<sup>2</sup> and Jesus' subsequent use of one of the fishing boats as a floating pulpit. In fact, it is specifically mentioned that the boat belongs to Simon, thus setting the stage for the incident in vv.4-11.

The event itself reported in vv.4-11 is of particular importance for our consideration of the miracle

---

Jesus in v.10 is directed only to Simon Peter.

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Bailey, op. cit., p. 14.

<sup>2</sup>H. Schürmann, "Die Verheissung an Simon Petrus," Bibel und Leben 5 (1964), p. 20, calls attention to the significance of Luke's reference to "the word of God" in this context: "Nur Lukas lässt schon Jesus das 'Wort Gottes' reden . . . , so theologisch anmerkend, dass die kirchliche Verkündigung mit Jesus ihren Anfang nahm, oder besser: dass die spätere apostolische Verkündigung die Jesu fortsetzt."

stories in the third Gospel. In Mark Jesus' call to the disciples comes at the outset of his ministry and requires no preliminaries; this, however, is not the case in Luke. In Luke the decision of Simon Peter and those with him to follow Jesus only comes after Jesus' ministry is well underway (4:14-44) and after they themselves have witnessed the miracle of the fish. Conzelmann states,

The style of the call is very different from Mark. It follows upon a miracle, whilst Mark bases it on the ἐξουσία expressed in the call itself. Whereas in Mark the idea of the creative word appears, in Luke the mighty deed and the word of the Kingdom are two separate factors. In Mark the call comes at the beginning, as part of the eschatological preliminaries, but in Luke it has to be preceded by a miraculous demonstration.<sup>1</sup>

By employing the miraculous catch of fish as the basis for the call to Simon Peter, Luke has demonstrated that he has seen in the miracles of Jesus obvious revelatory value. In this instance both Simon Peter and those who are with him are seized by amazement (v.9--θάμβος) at the sight of the miraculous catch of fish (ἐπὶ τῇ ἁγρᾷ τῶν ἰχθύων ἣ συνέλαβον), and this provides the explanation

---

<sup>1</sup>pp. 41f. Schürmann, *op. cit.*, p. 21, states, "Anders als Mk 1,17.20; 2,14 eignet die Wirkmächtigkeit, die diese Fischer in die Nachfolge hebt, nicht dem Worte Jesu allein, sondern entscheidend dieser Machttat Jesu."



for the action of Simon Peter in v.8. He falls down before Jesus and says, "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord." In other words, the miracle not only precipitates the reaction of amazement in those who witness it but also, because it has revealed the majesty of Jesus, causes Simon to make his confession. Although in v.5 Luke has placed the title ἐπιστάτα on the lips of Simon, he has used κύριε in v.8b since only this latter title could be appropriately coupled with the confession of Simon.<sup>1</sup>

Although it is obvious that Luke has linked the subject of the catch of fish with the promise of Jesus to Simon Peter, "Do not be afraid;<sup>2</sup> henceforth you will be catching men" (v.10b), it is not at all certain how much symbolic value he has assigned to the miraculous catch of fish. Perhaps, Luke has intended the great

---

<sup>1</sup>It seems likely that κύριε was in Luke's source material, but it is probable that he was the one to introduce ἐπιστάτα into v.5 since he has done so elsewhere (cf. 8:24,45; 9:33,49; see also 17:13, for which there is no Markan parallel). Cf. Hahn, p. 85.

<sup>2</sup>In Luke μὴ φοβοῦ is sometimes spoken by an angelic messenger to dispel the fear of men (1:13; 1:30; 2:10; cf. also Acts 27:24), and it is sometimes spoken by Jesus (8:50; 12:4,7; 12:32). As Schürmann, *op. cit.*, p. 22, points out, these words are characteristic of the risen and glorified Lord (cf. Mt. 28:10; Rev. 1:17).

catch to be a prefigurement of the success of the Church's missionary activity,<sup>1</sup> but it seems unlikely that he has allegorized this incident to the same extent as has the fourth evangelist in Jn. 21:1ff., in which a related story is recounted.<sup>2</sup>

As in 8:22-25, the majesty and power of Jesus are manifested on the lake (λίμνη),<sup>3</sup> but, as we have seen,

---

<sup>1</sup>Creed, p. 73, and Richardson, p. 110, assume that Luke has seen the enormous catch as a foreshadowing of the success of the Christian mission. More particularly, Creed sees this to be a reference to the Gentile mission of the early Church (cf. Bailey, *op. cit.*, p. 16). Loisy, *Évangiles Synoptiques*, vol. 1, p. 445, goes beyond the evidence when he declares, "Le Sauveur dans la barque, instruisant les Galiléens, figure la prédication de l'Évangile aux Juifs; l'ordre donné à Simon d'avancer en pleine mer, où se fait une pêche abondante, figure la prédication aux Gentils. La réflexion de Pierre sur l'inutilité du travail antérieur remplace une simple indication de la source qui n'avait aucune portée allégorique; mais Luc y a vu sans doute une allusion à l'insuccès de la prédication apostolique auprès des Juifs, à l'hésitation momentanée de Pierre devant la question des Gentils, et au parti qu'il prend, dans les Actes, d'après une révélation divine, de se rendre à la prière de Cornélius." Cf., finally, Gilmour, *I.B.*, vol. 8, pp. 100f., who warns against allegorizing this story.

<sup>2</sup>For a discussion of the relationship between 5:1-11 and Jn. 21:1-14, cf. Bailey, *op. cit.*, pp. 12-17. Cf. also C. H. Dodd, "The Appearances of the Risen Christ: An Essay in Form-Criticism of the Gospels," *Studies in the Gospels*, ed. D. E. Nineham ("Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot"; Oxford, 1955), pp. 22f.

<sup>3</sup>Conzelmann, p. 42, concludes, "Throughout Luke the lake is more a 'theological' than a geographical factor. It is a place of manifestations which demonstrate the power of Jesus."

what is particularly noteworthy is that in 5:1-11 the third evangelist has used the miraculous deed of Jesus in connexion with the call and commission to Simon Peter. In addition, Luke has undoubtedly seen the incident reported in 5:1-11 in relationship to 4:16-30 since although the people in Nazareth had violently rejected Jesus and his message, Simon Peter and the sons of Zebedee respond positively and follow him. By means of this pericope, in which Jesus is pictured in terms of his post-Easter power and lordship, Luke has indicated that the disciples, whose efforts continued the work of Christ in the early Church, were first commissioned during the earthly ministry of Jesus.<sup>1</sup>

The Cleansing of the Leper--Lk. 5:12-16  
(Mk. 1:40-45; Mt. 8:1-4)

Although Luke has not abbreviated the Markan account to the same extent as Matthew has, he has re-written the opening and closing verses of the pericope. In addition, the third evangelist has made a few other alterations, some of which agree with those made by the

---

<sup>1</sup>According to Schürmann, op. cit., pp. 18ff., the primary purpose of this story was to anchor in the pre-Easter will of Jesus the authority of the apostles--and particularly that of Peter--which was demonstrated in the early Church's mission.

first evangelist in Mt. 8:1-4.<sup>1</sup>

Having inserted the Petrine incident in 5:1-11, Luke has resumed the Markan order with the story of the cleansing of the leper. (Cf. 5:12-6:16 with Mk. 1:40-3:19a.) Unlike Mark, who has included no geographical reference in this story, Luke has provided a setting by noting that Jesus was encountered by the leper "while he was in one of the cities" (v.12). There is a strong possibility that by means of these words Luke has wanted to refer back to 4:43, where Jesus--whose ministry was announced in Nazareth (4:16-30) and begun in Capernaum (4:31ff.)--asserts that he " . . . must preach the good news of the kingdom of God to the other cities also."<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, in the light of the intervening story which takes place in Capernaum at the lake of Gennesaret,

---

<sup>1</sup>Luke and Matthew have the following words in common over against Mark: ἰδοὺ, κύριε, αὐτοῦ λέγων and εὐθέως (5:12f. and Mt. 8:2f.). It is likely that these verbal agreements resulted from independent redaction and are not indications of Luke's use of the Matthean version or vice versa.

<sup>2</sup>Most commentators (Creed, p. 76; Conzelmann, p. 43; Grundmann, Lukas, p. 129; Lagrange, Luc, p. 163; Loisy, Evangiles Synoptiques, vol. 1, p. 464) assume that Luke is connecting 5:12 with 4:43f. Leaney, p. 124, states that Luke " . . . seems always inclined to imagine that important events must happen in important places, that is, towns." Cf. further H. J. Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts (2nd ed.; London, 1958), pp. 245-249, who draws attention to the fact " . . . that Luke writes from the urban standpoint."

the geographical notice in 5:12 is somewhat abrupt.

Luke's rewriting of v.12b reveals both his interest in the leper who requests that Jesus cleanse him and in Jesus himself, who has the power to accomplish this miracle. By means of the words ἰδὼν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν, πεσὼν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ἐδεήθη αὐτοῦ λέγων κύριε (v.12b), Luke has described more logically than Mark (Mk. 1:40b-- παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν καὶ γονυπετῶν λέγων αὐτῷ ὅτι ) the manner in which the leper approaches Jesus: he sees Jesus, prostrates himself and then presents his request.<sup>1</sup> Further, by including the words πεσὼν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ἐδεήθη<sup>2</sup> αὐτοῦ λέγων κύριε Luke has not only heightened the note of reverence which the leper exhibits before Jesus but also has accented the Christological significance of the passage. For Luke, as indeed for Matthew, Jesus is approached as the "Lord" who has the power to answer this plea of the leper and cleanse him from the terrible disease of leprosy. Finally, it should be noted that the third evangelist has exaggerated the seriousness of the man's condition with the words ἀνὴρ πλήρης λεπρός (v.12). Luke has

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Lagrange, Luc, p. 163.

<sup>2</sup>Except for Mt. 9:38 (the parallel of 10:2), δεῖσθαι is used only by Luke and Paul in the New Testament. Cf. 8:28,38; 9:38,40; 10:2; 21:36; 22:32.



probably drawn attention to the seriousness of the leprosy in order to emphasize the magnitude of the cure which is effected by Jesus, who has already been depicted as πλήρης πνεύματος (4:1).

Luke has quite faithfully reproduced Mk. 1:41f., omitting only the words καὶ ἐκαθαρίσθη undoubtedly to avoid redundancy. In addition, however, he has eliminated both references to the emotions of Jesus (cf. Mk. 1:41a and 1:43). If the Greek word ὀργισθεῖς were in the Markan story which Luke knew,<sup>1</sup> it is readily understandable why the third evangelist would have omitted this word and the whole of v.43. Without these references Luke has been able to present a more exalted picture of Jesus, one which is consistent with the character of him who is addressed as "Lord."

Although Luke has removed the references to the emotions of Jesus, he has retained the content of Mk. 1:44, in which Jesus commands silence regarding the miracle and instructs the healed leper to show himself to the priest.<sup>2</sup> It is doubtful, however, that Luke has

---

<sup>1</sup>Creed, p. 77, thinks that Luke would not have omitted a reference to Jesus' compassion and thus suggests that ὀργισθεῖς is the original reading in Mk. 1:41.

<sup>2</sup>By inserting the word κατήγγειλεν Luke has, in fact, strengthened the command of Jesus. Cf. 8:56 and 9:21, in which this word also appears in conjunction with the secrecy motif.

attached the same importance to it as Mark has. In the second Gospel the command for secrecy is related to Jesus' identity, but this is obviously not the case in Luke since Jesus has already been addressed as "Lord" in v.12. In addition, the Lukan conclusion to this story (vv.15f.) suggests that Luke has interpreted the command for silence differently from Mark. In Mk. 1:45 it is the cleansed leper who vigorously proclaims what has happened so that Jesus must remain in the desert and not enter the city. Nevertheless, Jesus is unable to avoid publicity since the people come to him in the desert. In Luke, on the other hand, the disobedience of the healed leper is not even mentioned, and instead Luke has indicated that the news concerning Jesus (ὁ λόγος περὶ αὐτοῦ<sup>1</sup>) disseminates widely, causing great crowds to gather to hear him and to be healed by him (v.15--καὶ συνήρχοντο ὄχλοι πολλοὶ ἀκούειν καὶ θεραπεύεσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν ἀσθενειῶν αὐτῶν). In the Lukan account Jesus also journeys into the desert (v.16), but it should be noted that his departure is not to avoid the unwelcomed publicity which results from the healing but in order that

---

<sup>1</sup>We assume that περὶ αὐτοῦ refers to Jesus and not to the cleansed leper.

he might have the opportunity to pray.<sup>1</sup>

It must be concluded that Luke's alterations of Mk. 1:40-45 have not disclosed any consistent pattern of interpretation as was the case in the Matthean version.<sup>2</sup> Nonetheless, we have seen that the third evangelist is primarily interested in this story of the cleansing of the leper because it represents another example of Jesus' healing power. Luke's alteration of Mk. 1:45 is particularly noteworthy since he has again pictured Jesus as the One who heals as well as the One who preaches.

Although Luke has included the double command of Jesus for silence and for obedience to the requirements of the Mosaic law (v.14), there is no indication that either this secrecy theme or the reference to the law

---

<sup>1</sup>In addition to this instance, Luke has reported that Jesus was praying at his Baptism (3:21), before designating his disciples (6:12), before his identification as "the Christ of God" by his disciples (9:18), at his Transfiguration (9:28f.), before teaching the "Lord's Prayer" to his disciples (11:1), and on the Mount of Olives (22:41,44). Undoubtedly, this theme was important to Luke since in each case the reference to Jesus' practice of praying is associated with a significant event in the ministry of Jesus and his disciples. Perhaps, the reference in 5:16 is intended to be linked with the following pericope where Jesus asserts that the Son of man has authority to forgive sins.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. above, pp. 145-151.

was of special interest to him. Rather Luke has quite simply drawn attention to the One who heals as a fulfillment of his calling (cf. 4:16-30) and as a demonstration that the Messiah is present (cf. 7:22).

Finally, Luke has altered the Christological importance of the story by omitting the Markan references to the emotions of the earthly Jesus and by introducing the κύριος title into v.14.

The Healing of the Paralytic--  
Lk. 5:17-26 (Mk. 2:1-12; Mt. 9:1-8)

As in 5:12-16, Luke has altered relatively little of the central portion of the Markan narrative (Mk. 2:5-11) and has almost entirely reworded the beginning and closing verses. In vv.18f., in which he has described the efforts of the men who bring the paralytic to Jesus, Luke has recounted the same series of events as Mark has,<sup>1</sup> but in doing so he has employed a different vocabulary (cf. 5:18f. with Mk. 2:3f.). For example, the third evangelist has not mentioned that "four" men bring the paralytic to Jesus; he has substituted the word παραλελυμένος (vv.18,24b) for παραλυτικός and the words κλίνη (v.18) and κλινίδιον (vv.19,24) for Mark's κράβατος; he has described their ascent onto the

---

<sup>1</sup>It should be remembered that Matthew omitted the Markan description at this point (cf. Mt. 8:2).

roof by means of the words ἀναβάντες ἐπὶ τὸ δῶμα ; and he has explicitly noted that they lowered the paralytic in front of Jesus (ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ). It can be seen that Luke's reworking of Mk. 2:3f. has been done essentially for stylistic reasons.<sup>1</sup>

More relevant to our purposes than Luke's rewriting in vv.18f. is the way in which the third evangelist has introduced the story in v.17. No longer locating the incident in Capernaum, Luke has begun the story with the rather generalized time notice καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν. Further, he has not specifically mentioned that Jesus was in a house or that the crowd gathered in front of the door (cf. Mk. 2:1f.). Rather, Luke has noted that Jesus was teaching (καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν διδάσκων), undoubtedly as a substitution for Mark's observation that Jesus was speaking the word to the people (Mk. 2:2--καὶ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον).

What is particularly noteworthy is that Luke has informed his readers at the outset of the story that Jesus' opponents were present. He states, " . . .

---

<sup>1</sup>Hoskyns and Davey, p. 84, cite this story of the healing of the paralytic as one instance where both Matthew and Luke have made alterations because they " . . . felt the Greek of Mark to be rough and his method of writing narrative to be verbose."



there were Pharisees and teachers of the law (νομοδιδάσκαλοι) sitting by, who had come from every village of Galilee and Judea and from Jerusalem . . . " Mark's first mention of the opponents of Jesus is in 2:6, in which he has reported that " . . . certain of the scribes were sitting there . . . ", but at that point in the narrative (v.21) Luke has added οἱ φαρισαῖοι to make it consistent with his reference in v.17.<sup>1</sup> Probably Luke has named Jesus' opposition at the beginning (v.17) and has drawn attention to the extensive geographical area from which they came<sup>2</sup> in order to heighten the significance of the episode which is to follow.

The final sentence in Luke's introductory verse (v.17) declares that " . . . the power of the Lord was with him Jesus to heal" (καὶ δύνάμις κυρίου<sup>3</sup> ἦν εἰς τὸ

---

<sup>1</sup>Since Luke has retained the Markan reference to "the scribes" (οἱ γραμματεῖς) in v.21, it seems likely that he is identifying them with the "teachers of the law" (νομοδιδάσκαλοι) in v.17. Perhaps the third evangelist has inserted νομοδιδάσκαλοι in v.17 to clarify for his Gentile readers the function of the scribes.

<sup>2</sup>Luke has perhaps borrowed from Mk. 3:22 the statement that the scribes had come from Jerusalem since he has failed to refer to the scribes or their place of origin in his version of the Beelzebub controversy in 11:14-16. Grundmann, Lukas, p. 130, observes that as in Mk. 3:7 Galilee, Judea and Jerusalem all are mentioned. In that passage, however, Mark is reporting whence those in the crowd came.

<sup>3</sup>In this context κυρίου probably refers to "God" and not to "Jesus." Cf. Plummer, p. 152.

ἰᾶσθαι αὐτόν). Elsewhere (cf. especially 4:36, 6:19 and 8:46) the third evangelist has coupled the word δύναμις with instances of Jesus' healing, and as we have already seen,<sup>1</sup> Luke has used both δύναμις and πνεῦμα in close conjunction. For this reason, Luke's reference to Jesus' power to heal is probably intended as an indication that what Jesus is about to do--heal the paralytic--is possible only because Jesus is endowed by the Spirit of God.<sup>2</sup> In other words, Jesus' power to heal is derived from God just as the authority to forgive sins on earth is God's prerogative which is delegated to Jesus as the "Son of man."

Luke's rewording of the concluding verses (vv.25f.) further demonstrates that for the third evangelist the healing activity of Jesus, and also in this case his willingness to forgive sins, reveals the work of God.

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. above, pp. 282f.

<sup>2</sup>Barrett, The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition, p. 76, states rather cautiously, "One passage remains in which we may perhaps see, though not with the same certainty, the equivalence of spirit and power. In the description of the healing of the paralytic, Lk. says (5:17) 'the power of the Lord was with him to heal'. It will be remembered that Lk. has only just quoted (in 4:18f.) Is. 61:1, 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me . . . he hath sent me to proclaim . . . recovery of sight to the blind', etc. But this parallel cannot be pressed and 5:17 is perhaps simply another instance of the use of δύναμις for miraculous power."

The healed paralytic (v.25-- δοξάζων τὸν θεόν) and the witnessing crowd (v.26-- καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν θεόν) give praise to God for what has taken place. As in the story of the raising of the son of the widow of Nain (cf. 7:16), Luke has indicated that the praise of the crowd is connected with the fear they experienced in the light of the event (καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν φόβου λέγοντες ὅτι εἶδομεν παράδοξα σήμερον). Finally, Luke has emphasized the "suddenness" of the miracle by placing παραχρῆμα at the beginning of v.25. The εὐθύς was less emphatic since it followed the reference to the man's getting up (cf. Mk. 2:12).<sup>1</sup>

To a lesser extent than the first evangelist, Luke has moulded the conclusion of the story to highlight the major theme of the pericope--Jesus' authority to forgive sins. Nevertheless, in view of another Lukan pericope (7:36-50) it is to be assumed that the third evangelist held this theme to be important.<sup>2</sup> As we

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Held, pp. 177f.

<sup>2</sup>In addition, cf. 3:33 and 1:77, in which the forgiveness of sins is linked with the mission of John the Baptist; 4:18f., in which a major part of Jesus' earthly mission is "to proclaim release (ἀφεσιν) to the captives"; 11:4 and 17:3f., in which Jesus teaches his disciples to forgive; and 24:47, in which Jesus commissions his disciples to proclaim repentance and (if καὶ is taken as the correct reading) forgiveness in his name. Luke has shown that this final commission is carried out by the apostles. Cf. esp. Acts 2:38; 10:43; 13:38. See also Acts 5:31 and 26:18.

have already noted, Luke has changed the central part of the pericope very little. He has replaced τέχνον (Mk. 2:5) with ἄνθρωπε (v.20), a less affectionate word of address,<sup>1</sup> and has written the perfect form ἀφένται instead of the present (Mk. 2:5--ἀφίενται).<sup>2</sup> In addition, Dupont supposes that Luke's rewording of the enemies' charge of blasphemy against Jesus is significant. Mark has τί οὗτος οὕτως λαλεῖ; βλασφημεῖ (Mk. 2:7a) which Luke has changed to read: τίς ἐστὶν οὗτος ὃς λαλεῖ βλασφημίας (v.21). Dupont notes that this identical phrase occurs in the story of the sinful woman (7:36ff.) and concludes that Luke has intended the question to be concerned more directly with the identity of Jesus. He states,

La question concerne directement l'identité de Jésus. Elle revient dans les mêmes termes in 7,49: "τίς οὗτος ἐστὶν?" Par la manière dont elle est posée, la question prépare la réponse, dans laquelle Jésus s'identifie au Fils de l'homme.<sup>3</sup>

In the story about the woman (7:36ff.) Luke has made

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. 12:14 and 22:58.

<sup>2</sup>Conzelmann, p. 228, cites this change in verb tense in v.20 and v.23 to support his conclusion that for Luke "repentance" and "forgiveness" are considered to be two separate stages in the process by which one becomes a Christian. Cf. also Lagrange, Luc, p. 167, who suggests that by his use of the perfect tense Luke has sought to emphasize the permanence of the forgiveness.

<sup>3</sup>Op. cit., p. 944.

it clear that this woman was a sinner (7:37,39), but like Mark he has said nothing in 5:17-26 to suggest that there was a specific reason for Jesus' pronouncement of forgiveness over the paralytic. Like Mark, the third evangelist has probably viewed the reference to "their faith" in v.20 as applying to the paralytic as well as to those men who brought him to Jesus.<sup>1</sup> The presence in this pericope of the logion regarding the Son of man's authority to forgive sins explains why the sins of the paralytic are forgiven by Jesus.

We have thus seen that Luke in 5:17-26 has altered most drastically the introduction and conclusion of the Markan account. In doing so, he has drawn attention to the part played by the opponents of Jesus in the incident and has caused them to ask a more specifically Christological question in v.21. Both v.17 and the concluding verses (vv.25f.) show that Luke was interested

---

<sup>1</sup>Rengstorff, p. 79, suggests that τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν refers exclusively to the faith of the bearers, thus explaining why Jesus pronounces forgiveness before he heals the paralytic. As further evidence, Rengstorff notes that the healed paralytic glorifies God (v.25), thereby demonstrating that he now believes even though at first he did not have faith. Since Luke has given no clear indication that he considered the paralytic to be a sinner and since he has elsewhere described the response of the healed person in similar terms (cf. 13:13; 17:15; 18:43), Rengstorff's suggestion is to be rejected.



in the healing power of Jesus as a manifestation of God's activity among men. Although it would appear that Luke has not interpreted this pericope under the theme of the authority to forgive sins to the same extent as Matthew has, it is obvious that this subject, as well as Jesus' healings, is important to this Gospel as 7:36-50 demonstrates.

The Healing of the Man with the Withered Hand--Lk. 6:6-11 (Mk. 3:1-6; Mt. 12:9-14)

By means of the words which introduce this story (v.6) Luke has not only indicated the progress which Jesus is making in his tour of the Galilean villages (ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ἑτέρῳ σαββάτῳ<sup>1</sup>) but also, unlike Mark, he has provided the reason for Jesus' entry into the synagogue (καὶ διδάσκειν).<sup>2</sup> Having altered the Markan account in these ways, Luke has essentially repeated the remainder of the story of the healing of the man with the withered hand as the second evangelist had it in his Gospel.

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Conzelmann, pp. 44ff.

<sup>2</sup>Schmidt, p. 103, declares, "Mit dem Zusatz καὶ διδάσκειν belebt Lk die Szenerie und gibt mit dieser Notiz an, warum Jesus sich in die Synagoge begeben hat." Cf. Conzelmann, pp. 222-224, for Luke's use of the word διδάσκειν in his Gospel.

Luke has reproduced v.9 of this controversy story almost word for word from the Markan account.<sup>1</sup> In doing so he, too, has drawn attention to the dramatic tension over the observance of the sabbath which existed between Jesus and his opponents. By healing the man's hand Jesus is involved in restoring life while the evil intentions of the opponents exhibit the opposite effects. In the second Gospel the option of doing good or evil, saving life or destroying it, is possibly to be understood in the light of the concluding verse where the Pharisees take counsel with the Herodians to destroy Jesus (cf. Mk. 3:6). In Luke, however, the final verse appears to be less harsh and more vague since he has not explicitly mentioned the plot of Jesus' enemies. Instead Luke has stated that " . . . they were filled with fury and discussed with one another what they might do to Jesus" (v.11).<sup>2</sup> The third evangelist has probably altered this verse to avoid sounding the death note for Jesus too early in his Gospel. Grundmann notes this

---

<sup>1</sup>It should be observed that Luke has substituted ἀγαθοποιῆσαι for Mark's ἀγαθὸν ποιῆσαι and ἀπολέσαι for Mark's ἀποκτεῖναι.

<sup>2</sup>It should be noted that Luke has eliminated Mark's reference to the Herodians as he has also at 20:20 (cf. Mk. 12:13).

when he says,

Da Lukas auf die Initiative Jesu bei seinem Tod Wert legt und er erst im grossen "Reisebericht" nach der ersten Ankündigung (9,22) davon spricht (9,51), kann er diesen Beschluss an dieser Stelle nicht brauchen.<sup>1</sup>

In Mark the opponents in this incident are explicitly named for the first time in the concluding verse, but this is not the case in the third Gospel. As in the story of the healing of the paralytic (5:17-26) Luke has set the stage for the subsequent action by referring to Jesus' enemies at the beginning of the story. In v.7 he has mentioned that both "the scribes and the Pharisees" (οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ φαρισαῖοι) are waiting in the synagogue to see if Jesus will heal this man, thus breaking the sabbath regulations. It appears that Luke has mentioned the opponents earlier in the story because this makes the scene both more dramatic and logical, not because he has wanted to direct a polemic against the scribes and Pharisees.

As in the story of the leper (cf. 5:13) Luke has refrained from mentioning the anger of Jesus and thereby has presented a more exalted picture of Jesus.<sup>2</sup> He

---

<sup>1</sup>Lukas, p. 135. Cf. further Schmidt, p. 103.

<sup>2</sup>Thus Creed, p. 85; Leaney, p. 131; and Loisy, Évangiles Synoptiques, vol. 1, p. 517.

has simply stated that Jesus after looking around at all (πάντας) of them tells the man to stretch out his hand. It should be noted, however, that Luke has not entirely eliminated the reference to the evil which was in the Pharisees' hearts (cf. Mk. 3:5) since in v.8 he has already indicated that Jesus realized that they had evil intentions (αὐτὸς δὲ ᾔδει τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς αὐτῶν).

Finally, Luke has noted that it is the right (δεξιὰ) hand of the man which is withered. In the light of this observation we should not assume that the third evangelist was particularly interested in the man who was healed.<sup>1</sup> As in Mark, the actual healing of the man's hand comes as a demonstration of Jesus' attitude to the sabbath. By means of this incident, which is the last of this series of controversy stories (cf. 5:17-6:11), it is further illustrated that the Son of man is the Lord of the sabbath (cf. v.5).

We have seen that Luke has not altered this Markan story to the same extent as Matthew. Rather he has

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. 22:50, in which only Luke has indicated that it was the "right" ear of the servant which was cut off. Cf. Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts, p. 178, who denies that these references of Luke support the thesis that he was a physician.

quite faithfully followed the Markan account and has only occasionally changed details; he has provided a different time reference and has indicated that Jesus is teaching in the synagogue; and he has named the opponents of Jesus from the outset of the story and pictured Jesus' discerning their thoughts (v.8a). Luke's final verse describes the reaction of Jesus' enemies but does not indicate that his death was being planned. All in all, it would appear that Luke has made these minor changes for the sake of clarification and not to emphasize a specific doctrinal point.

The Healing of the Centurion's Servant--  
Lk. 7:1-10 (Mt. 8:5-13)

By reporting the healing of the centurion's servant directly after the Sermon on the Plain, Luke has probably preserved the order of the material as he found it in Q.<sup>1</sup> As in the first Gospel, the story in Luke takes place in Capernaum but in the third Gospel this is not the first time that Jesus comes to this city (cf. 4:31).

As we have already observed in the consideration of Mt. 8:5-13, the Matthean and the Lukan versions correspond closely only in the central portion of the story

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. W. G. Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament, trans. A. J. Mattill, Jr. (London, 1966), p. 54.



(7:6b-9 and Mt. 8:8b-10) while the opening and closing narratives diverge considerably from one another. Although there is a problem in regard to the relationship between these narrative sections (7:1-6a; Mt. 8:5-8a),<sup>1</sup> the differences should be noted to determine whether the third evangelist has interpreted this story differently from Matthew.

We have noted that in Matthew the centurion himself comes to Jesus, but it is to be observed that in Luke he sends elders of the Jews to request Jesus' help for the ill servant. When the elders come to Jesus, they make their plea to him on the basis of the centurion's laudable behaviour and his devotion to the Jewish nation, the proof of which is demonstrated by the fact that he built a synagogue for them (vv.4f.). Hearing this, Jesus responds to their request by going with them to the centurion's house. Their journey is interrupted, however, some distance from the house by a second group of friends (v.6--φίλους). They convey the centurion's message in which he admits his own

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. above, p. 151, fn. 2. In addition, the words in vv.6b-9 are in the first person and are rather awkwardly placed in the mouths of those who intermediate for the centurion. Nevertheless, all this does not necessarily imply that the Matthean version is the one which stood in Q.

unworthiness: "Lord, do not bother, for I am not worthy that you should come under my roof; therefore I have not considered myself worthy to come to you, but say the word and let my servant be healed."<sup>1</sup>

Unlike Matthew, Luke has used the testimony of the Jewish elders to overcome the hesitation of Jesus to make contact with a Gentile,<sup>2</sup> and thus presents the centurion as a devout man who makes a splendid representative of the God-fearing Gentiles. Luke has quite clearly emphasized the fact that the centurion recognizes his own unworthiness before Jesus as his insertion of the words διὸ οὐδὲ ἑμαυτὸν ἡξιῶσα πρὸς σὲ ἐλθεῖν<sup>3</sup> indicates. These words, which give expression to the centurion's humility, explain why the centurion himself does not directly enter the scene.

It is obvious that the third evangelist has pictured this Gentile most favourably but, unlike Matthew (cf. Mt. 8:11f.), he has not done so at the expense of the Jews. Jesus' words commending the faith of the

---

<sup>1</sup>This is our own rendering of the Greek.

<sup>2</sup>Thus Bultmann, History, p. 39.

<sup>3</sup>These words are probably due to Luke's redaction not only because they are not found in Matthew but also because of the word ἡξιῶσα which provides a link with ἄξιος in v.4.

centurion stand as the climax to both accounts (7:9 and Mt. 8:10), but, unlike Matthew, Luke has not suggested the impossibility of the existence of such faith in Israel; in other words, Luke has emphasized the worthiness and faith of the Gentile without a direct polemic against the Jews. As we have seen,<sup>1</sup> Strecker calls attention to this fact by noting the difference in the meanings of οὐδέ in v.9 and καὶ οὐδενί in Mt. 8:10.

Without a doubt, Luke was principally interested in this story because it witnesses to a believing Gentile who trusted in Jesus' word to heal his servant. As the result, the healing which takes place at a distance is of only secondary importance. The third evangelist, in fact, has failed to include any healing word of Jesus (cf. Mt. 8:13) and has confirmed the miracle by means of v.10, in which it is stated that the servant was found healthy (ὕγιαίνοντα) by those who returned to the centurion's house.<sup>2</sup> Although in contrast to Matthew's βέβληται ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ παραλυτικός, δεινῶς βασανιζόμενος (Mt. 8:6) the third evangelist has initially

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. above, p. 155.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Grundmann, Lukas, p. 158.

described the servant's condition with the words κακῶς ἔχων ἡμελλεν τελευτᾶν (v.2), there is no real reason to suppose that Luke has thereby intended to heighten the miracle. The miracle is only important because it provides the reason for the centurion's indirect approach to Jesus.

Thus we have observed that the major theme of the Lukan account concerns the faith of the Gentile. Although the Matthean version presents essentially the same theme, it does so by means of the dialogue between Jesus and the centurion; in Luke, however, the centurion never meets Jesus, and Jesus himself speaks only once (v.9). The attention of the reader is directed to the figure of the Gentile, his sympathy with Judaism, and his profound humility.

The Raising of the Widow's Son at Nain--  
Lk. 7:11-17

This pericope belongs to Luke's special material, and it would appear that at some stage in its transmission its form was influenced by Old Testament passages (I Ki. 17:17-24; cf. also II Ki. 4:18-37).<sup>1</sup> As

---

<sup>1</sup>In both stories it is the son of a widow who has died. Fuller, Miracles, p. 64, and Richardson, p. 113, call attention to the fact that the words in v.15 καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ agree with those in I Ki. 17:23 (Septuagint) as well as noting that in v.16 Jesus is

the story now stands in the third Gospel, it possesses considerable drama. Creed draws attention to certain of the details which enliven the narrative:

The incident is described with picturesque detail and with a conscious delight in the storyteller's art. Jesus, attended by his disciples and a large multitude, approaches the city at the very moment that the funeral procession issues forth. The sorrowing, the sympathetic townsfolk, Jesus moved with compassion, the bearers, the young man, are all vividly portrayed.<sup>1</sup>

It is difficult to say just how much of the description in this pericope is due to Luke's redaction. Although we cannot determine with certainty if the third evangelist has introduced the reference to the disciples and the crowd into v.11,<sup>2</sup> it does seem likely that he has inserted the word *μονογενής* in v.12 since he has elsewhere employed this word to heighten the tragedy of the

---

described as a great prophet. Since Luke has introduced similar words to those in v.15 elsewhere in his Gospel (9:42--*ἀπέδωκεν αὐτὸν τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ*), we should not assume too quickly that the words in v.15 were directly derived from the Elijah story. If the Lukan narrative has been influenced by these Old Testament stories, it was only in a general way.

<sup>1</sup>Pp. 102f.

<sup>2</sup>Conzelmann, p. 164, observes that *λαός*, not *ὄχλος*, is preferred by Luke. This might suggest that *ὄχλος* in both v.11 and v.12 was part of the pre-Lukan story. Grundmann, *Lukas*, p. 159, notes that the last reference to Jesus' disciples was at 6:12ff.



situation (8:42; 9:38). Not only is this woman a widow but it is her only son who has died and is now being carried out of the city. Grundmann sums up the drama of the situation when he declares, "Vor dem Stadttor begegnet der Zug des Lebens den Zug des Todes."<sup>1</sup>

It is this scene which causes Jesus to have compassion for the bereaved woman. Straightway it is reported that Jesus comforts her (μὴ κλαῖε), stops the funeral procession (v.14a--καὶ προσελθὼν ἤψατο τῆς σοροῦ, οἱ δὲ βαστάζοντες ἕστησαν), and restores the boy's life by means of a word (v.14b--καὶ εἶπεν νεανίσκε, σοὶ λέγω, ἐγέρθητι). As proof of the miracle the dead boy sits up and begins to speak (v.15a), at which time Jesus returns him to his mother (v.15b). Seeing this, the witnesses are overcome with fear and glorify God, declaring that a prophet has come into their midst (v.16).

As it can be seen quite readily, in 7:11-17 Luke has focused his attention almost exclusively on the miraculous deed itself--the raising of the dead--and has in no way subordinated it to any other theme. For example, there is no mention of the faith of the woman. She makes no request to Jesus for her son; instead it is

---

<sup>1</sup>Lukas, p. 159.

Jesus who initiates the action which results in the miracle. This is not a usual characteristic of miracle stories<sup>1</sup> (cf. Mt. 8:14f.), but in this instance Jesus' initiative activity is apparently motivated by his compassion. The reference to Jesus' compassion (v.13--ὁ κύριος<sup>2</sup> ἐσπλαγχνίσθη) was probably part of the pre-Lukan pericope since the third evangelist has shown little interest in this theme elsewhere and has even eliminated it from some of his sources.<sup>3</sup>

This pericope shows certain evidences of Lukan vocabulary,<sup>4</sup> and it is indeed likely that Luke has given

<sup>1</sup>Fuller, Miracles, p. 64, unlike most commentators, does note this unique feature of 7:11-17.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Creed, pp. 103f., who refers to the passages where Luke, unlike Mark and Matthew, uses ὁ κύριος in the narrative to name Jesus. He lists 7:19; 10:1,39,41; 11:39; 12:42; 13:15; 17:5; 18:6; 19:8; 22:31,61; 24:3, and to these should be added 17:6 and perhaps 19:31,34. The frequent appearance of the κύριος title is evidence that the confession of the early Church has influenced the traditional narratives.

<sup>3</sup>σπλαγχνίζεσθαι does appear in the stories of the Good Samaritan (10:33) and the Prodigal Son (15:20), but Luke has eliminated the word in 9:11 (cf. Mk. 6:34), 9:42 (cf. Mk. 9:22) and possibly in 5:13 (cf. Mk. 1:41). In addition, the reference in Mk. 8:2 is in the Markan section (Mk. 6:45-8:26) which is completely omitted by Luke. It is interesting to note that Dibelius, p. 75, supposes that the reference to Jesus' compassion in 7:13 was added by Luke. Cf. Richardson, p. 33.

<sup>4</sup>καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ is a Lukan construction (cf. 1:59, 5:1, 5:12); ἐξῆς occurs only in 7:11, 9:37, Acts 21:1, 25:17 and 27:18 in the New Testament; and ὡς δὲ ἤγγισεν

shape to v.16 as well as to v.17,<sup>1</sup> in which it is indicated that the report about Jesus<sup>2</sup> goes out into the whole of Judea and the surrounding territory.<sup>3</sup> Elsewhere the third evangelist has concluded miracle stories by reporting that the healed person or the crowd glorifies God (cf. especially 5:25f. and 13:13; 17:15; 18:43), but in this case a new detail is added--their praise includes an acknowledgement that God has visited his people by raising up a great prophet in their midst (ὅτι προφήτης μέγας ἦγέρθη ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ ὅτι ἐπεσκέψατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ). The acclamation of Jesus as a prophet mighty before God and all the people is a theme which is again emphasized by Luke in the Emmaus story (cf. 24:19) and fits in quite satisfactorily with his portrayal of the miracle stories.

Without a doubt, the third evangelist has used 7:11-17 as another example of the powerful deeds of

---

appears to be Lukan (cf. 19:41). In addition, Schmidt, p. 115, assumes that πόλιν καλουμένην has resulted from Luke's redaction (cf. 4:16 and 4:31).

<sup>1</sup>Bultmann, History, p. 215, and Gilmour, I.B., vol. 8, p. 133, suppose that v.17 is an editorial addition.

<sup>2</sup>It is noteworthy that the words περὶ αὐτοῦ are not found in the following MSS: S \* 1574 ff<sup>2</sup> l.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Conzelmann, pp. 40ff., esp. 46, for Luke's use of Ἰουδαία and περίχωρος.

Jesus through which the people see the activity of God. In addition, he has inserted this story before the episode involving John the Baptist to provide support for the words *vexpoĩ ēyeípovtai* in 7:22. Unlike Mt. 11:2ff., Luke has prepared the way for Jesus' answer to the Christological question of John by stating in 7:21, "In that hour he cured many of diseases and plagues and evil spirits, and on many that were blind he bestowed sight." Thus by means of 7:11-17 and 7:21 (in particular the reference to the healing of the blind) he has paved the way for 7:22.

We have seen that 7:11-17 exhibits certain Lukan traits and that it definitely fits the Lukan presentation of the miracle stories. Luke has not allowed the miracle itself to become subservient to any other theme but has vividly pictured the plight of the woman, the action of Jesus and the reaction of the people. In light of the pericope which follows (7:22--in which the mighty acts of Jesus are listed) it becomes clear that Luke was particularly interested in the fact that in this narrative Jesus restores to life someone who has died since the raising of Jairus' daughter does not occur in his Gospel until 8:40ff.

The Stilling of the Storm--Lk. 8:22-25  
(Mk. 4:35-41; Mt. 8:23-27)

In Luke the incident involving the boat in the storm no longer takes place on the same day as does Jesus' parabolic teaching of the crowds (cf. Mk. 4:1ff.). Instead, the third evangelist has inserted directly before this pericope the story concerning Jesus' mother and brothers (8:19-21) and has substituted the general temporal reference ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν (8:22; cf. 5:17 and 20:1) for Mark's more definite notation of the time ἐν ἑσείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ὁψίας γενομένης (Mk. 4:35). Since, unlike Mark, Luke has not pictured the preceding teaching of Jesus as taking place by the sea, he was compelled to make a fresh start in 8:22. In addition, he has consistently omitted the word θάλασσα (Mk. 4:39,41), employing instead λίμνη, which to him probably seemed to be a more appropriate word for describing a small body of water.<sup>1</sup> In particular, Conzelmann<sup>2</sup> observes that the Sea of Galilee, which serves as the centre for the activity of Jesus in the second Gospel, plays a different part in the Lukan Gospel. In Luke the lake stands at the

---

<sup>1</sup>Thus Conzelmann, p. 42, and Grundmann, Lukas, p. 180.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. pp. 38ff., esp. p. 49.



border of Galilee and is the location where Jesus' power is manifested.

Luke had previously referred to the lake when he described the call of Peter (5:1-11); there also, the miraculous power of Jesus is demonstrated by means of the large catch of fish. Now in 8:22-25 it seems evident that Luke's alterations of the Markan account were intended not only to make the sequence of the story smoother and more logical<sup>1</sup> but also to focus the reader's attention on the fierceness of the storm and Jesus' subsequent rebuke of it.

Luke has prepared for the climax of the story by indicating that during the voyage Jesus goes to sleep (v.23a--πλεόντων δὲ αὐτῶν ἀφύπνωσεν). It is while Jesus is sleeping that the violent wind sweeps down on the lake causing those in the boat to be swamped and to be in real danger (v.23). From the Markan account Luke has retained in v.23 only the words λαῖλαψ ἀνέμου and has added the following words: κατέβη, λίμνην, συνεπληροῦντο and ἐκινδύνευον. By means of the word κινδυνεύειν Luke

---

<sup>1</sup>At the outset of the story Luke has described the action in the following order: Jesus and his disciples get into the boat, Jesus informs them where they are to go, and then they set forth (ἀνάγειν appears in v.22 and thirteen times in Acts). Cf. Schmidt, p. 139.

has summed up what he, and Mark before him with different words, sought to picture--the disciples find themselves in the gravest danger because of the storm. Luke's use of the verb καταβαίνειν in v.23 to describe the descent of the wind upon the lake is perhaps noteworthy. It has caused certain commentators to conclude that the third evangelist has here intended to portray the storm as a demon.<sup>1</sup> Such an explanation regarding Luke's use of καταβαίνειν is certainly not unreasonable since the third evangelist has probably interpreted the occurrence of ἐπιτιμᾶν as a sign of Jesus' control over the demonic.<sup>2</sup> It should be noted, however, that, unlike Mark, Luke has not apparently personified the sea. He has replaced τῇ θαλάσσῃ (Mk. 4:39) by the words τῷ κλύδωνι τοῦ ὕδατος (v.24) and has dropped the words σιώπα, κεφίμωσο. In Mark Jesus rebukes the wind and declares to the sea, "Peace, be still," but in Luke he rebukes both the wind and the raging water. Although, therefore, it cannot be determined with absolute certainty that in this story the third evangelist has intended to picture Jesus with authority

---

<sup>1</sup>Conzelmann, p. 49, favours this interpretation (see 9:54).

<sup>2</sup>Cf. 4:39, in which Luke inserts ἐπιτιμᾶν in the story of the healing of Simon's mother-in-law.

over the demonic forces, it is clear that he has emphasized Jesus' miraculous manifestation of power.

Finally, by eliminating the harsh question of the disciples (cf. Mk. 4:38)<sup>1</sup> and by rewording Jesus' question which is addressed to the disciples after the cessation of the storm, Luke has presented a more favourable picture of the disciples than Mark. The question *ποῦ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν* (v.25), in fact, presumes faith on the part of the disciples while in Mk. 4:40 they are accused of possessing no faith. Grundmann states,

Seine Frage an die Jünger setzt ihren Glauben voraus und fragt sie, wo er geblieben sei. Der Vorwurf an sie fehlt, aber die Frage nach dem Glauben wird so gestellt, dass deutlich wird: Der Glaube will in jeder Situation bewährt werden, weil er in Jesus den *ἐπιστάτην* bei sich hat.<sup>2</sup>

In spite of this less harsh portrayal of Jesus' disciples, it seems certain that, unlike Matthew,<sup>3</sup> the third evangelist has not changed this Markan story primarily because of his interest in the theme of discipleship. This conclusion is confirmed when we compare the final

---

<sup>1</sup> *ἐπιστάτα ἐπιστάτα, ἀπολλύμεθα* are the words of the disciples in the midst of the danger. For Luke's use of *ἐπιστάτης*, cf. above, p. 296.

<sup>2</sup> Lukas, p. 180. Cf. also Conzelmann, p. 49.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. above, pp. 163-168.

verse of the Lukan version with that of Mark and Matthew. In Mk. 4:41 "fear" is given as the reaction of the disciples, and in Mt. 8:27 "amazement" seems to be an appropriate description of the response of those who listen to this story. In this instance, however, Luke has referred to both the fear and the amazement of the people (φοβηθέντες δὲ ἐθαύμασαν) since these reactions are fitting in the presence of the miraculous deeds of Jesus (cf., e.g., 7:16; 8:35; 8:56; 9:43 and 11:14).

In conclusion the following can be said: Luke has considerably abbreviated the Markan account of the stilling of the storm, but at the same time he has preserved its emphasis on the demonstration of Jesus' power. Although Luke has not placed the disciples in as unfavourable light as the second evangelist has, there is little evidence to suggest that he is principally interested in this story as an example of what the nature of discipleship should be. Rather, the fear and amazement of the disciples bear witness to the One who commands and controls the wind and the water (v.25).

The Healing of the Gerasene Demoniac--  
Lk. 8:26-39 (Mk. 5:1-20; Mt. 8:28-34)

The Lukan version of this exorcism narrative is an abridgement of the Markan account, but, unlike the Matthean, all the major features have been retained. Luke, however, has introduced various new words into the account and has rearranged certain details of the story.

It is apparent that Luke's changes have resulted in a smoother and somewhat more logical narrative. For example, the third evangelist has omitted the description in Mk. 5:3-5 and has concisely recounted Jesus' meeting with this man who made his home among the tombs (v.27). Luke has simply described the man's condition by means of the words ἔχων δαιμόνια, has postponed until v.29 the reference to the fact that this man was often chained,<sup>1</sup> and has introduced two new features--the fact that the demoniac formerly lived in the city and the reference to the man's habit of going about without clothing. Undoubtedly, Luke has intended this latter reference as a preparation for v.35 (cf. Mk. 5:15--ἵματιούμενον), where he has indicated that the healed

---

<sup>1</sup>Haenchen, Der Weg, p. 192, also notes that Luke has replaced the Markan reference to "the mountains" (Mk. 5:5) with one to "the wilderness" (v.29). According to Haenchen, Luke did this since he did not know the hilly nature of the landscape at the eastern coast of the sea.



demoniac is fully clothed.<sup>1</sup>

Apart from these above mentioned alterations which render the narrative more readable, Luke has consistently drawn attention to the part played by the demons. He has expanded v.30b with the words " . . . for many demons had entered him" to make clear the connexion between the name "Legion" and the possession by the demons. Already in v.27 Luke has employed the word δαιμόνια instead of ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ (Mk. 5:2), and then he has repeated this word in vv.29,33,38.<sup>2</sup> All this leaves the reader with the impression that the "demons," together with Jesus, are the primary actors in this incident. They possess the man (v.27); they are responsible for his being in the deserted place (v.29); they account for the name "Legion" (v.30); they beg Jesus to send them into the swine and not into the abyss (v.31);<sup>3</sup> and they enter the herd of swine causing its destruction (v.33).

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Creed, pp. 120f.

<sup>2</sup>Luke has retained the reference to the "unclean spirit" in v.29 (τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ).

<sup>3</sup>It should be noted that in v.31 Luke has used the plural form of the verb (cf. παρεχάλουν with παρεχάλει in Mk. 5:10), suggesting that the demons, not the demon, are those who speak. The words λεγιῶν ὄνομά μοι, ὅτι πολλοί ἐσμεν in Mk. 5:9 indicate that the demon has a corporate personality, but Luke has not evidently wanted to preserve this feature.

Finally, two references are made to the fact that the demons have been driven out of the healed demoniac (vv.35,38).

Luke has substituted the words δέσφαί σου (v.28) for Mark's words ὀπιζω σε τὸν θεόν (Mk. 5:7). He has possibly done this since the words of the demon in the Markan account seemed rather harsh and inappropriate for the cry of a demon who recognizes Jesus as his master.<sup>1</sup> By mentioning ἄβυσσον (v.31)<sup>2</sup> the third evangelist has even suggested more strongly than Mark that the demons stand under the judgement of God, which is present in the person of Jesus. It is to be assumed that the demons together with the herd of swine are destroyed in the lake.<sup>3</sup>

Unlike the first evangelist, Luke has retained the concluding verses of the Markan story which report both

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Gilmour, I.B., vol. 8, p. 157, and Grundmann, Lukas, p. 181.

<sup>2</sup>The word ἄβυσσος appears only here in the Gospels. Cf. also Rev. 9:1,2,11; 11:7; 17:8; 20:1,3, where it designates the place of torment, the abode of demons. See finally Rom. 10:7.

<sup>3</sup>Leaney, p. 157, draws attention to the fact that in the Septuagint ἄβυσσος is used to describe the "sea" and suggests that Luke might possibly have had this Old Testament connexion in mind in this passage (ἄβυσσος in v.31 and λίμνην in v.33). Cf. further Conzelmann, pp. 44f., 50.

the negative reaction of the townspeople to Jesus and the request of the healed demoniac. In the first instance, the third evangelist has made it perfectly clear that fear was the motivation behind the Gerasenes' rejection of Jesus; by means of the explanatory words in v.37 (ὅτι φόβῳ μεγάλῳ συνείχοντο) he has drawn out the obvious implication of the previous reference to the people's fear (v.35). In the second case, Luke has not only called attention to Jesus' refusal of the healed demoniac's request to remain with him but by substituting ὁ θεός (v.39) for Mark's ὁ κύριος (Mk. 5:19) has also avoided any misunderstanding concerning Jesus' commission to the man. The healed demoniac is to return to his home and proclaim those things which God has accomplished for him. Like Mark, Luke has reported that the man did fulfil this assignment, but avoiding the reference to the Decapolis<sup>1</sup> he has stated that the man's preaching takes place throughout his own city.<sup>2</sup>

Finally, it should be noted that Luke has inserted the words κατὰ τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ into v.35 and has used the word ἐσώθη to describe the cure of the demoniac

---

<sup>1</sup>Decapolis as a geographical location is not mentioned in the third Gospel.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. again Cadbury, op. cit., p. 247.

(v.36). It is likely that the third evangelist has intended the man's position at the feet of Jesus to be a sign that he had become devoted to the one who had healed him, i.e., he had become a disciple (cf. 7:38 and 10:39).<sup>1</sup> In addition, since Luke has elsewhere closely linked πιστεύειν and σώζειν (cf. 8:12 and 8:50), it is at least possible that he has chosen the latter word to describe the man's cure since he views the man as a believer (vv.35,38). It is this "saved" one who is commissioned to proclaim (κηρύσσειν)<sup>2</sup> what God has done for him; but instead the man proclaims that which Jesus has done for him (v.39).

Thus, like Mark, Luke has used this story of the Gerasene demoniac as a demonstration of the power of Jesus in Gentile territory.<sup>3</sup> His various modifications

---

<sup>1</sup>Grundmann, Lukas, pp. 181f., declares, "Lukas betont, dass der Kranke zu Jesu Füßen sitzt . . . ; er ist Jesu Schüler geworden." G. W. H. Lampe, "Miracles in the Acts of the Apostles," Miracles, ed. C. F. D. Moule (London, 1965), p. 168, cites these words in 8:35 as another example of the Lukan tendency to associate the healings of Jesus with his ministry of the word. Cf. also Lagrange, Luc, p. 250.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Conzelmann, p. 222, for Luke's use of the word κηρύσσειν.

<sup>3</sup>When referring to Luke's geographical reference in v.26, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἀντικέρα τῆς Γαλιλαίας, Conzelmann, pp. 49f., states, "This precise reference indicates that what follows is in some way exceptional. If, in

of the Markan account have done more than create a stylistically acceptable narrative. Rather, Luke has more sharply drawn attention to the role played by the demons and the degree of their fear in the face of judgement and destruction, the fear of the townspeople in the presence of Jesus' manifestation of power, and the response of faith exhibited in the activity of the healed man. Although, unlike Matthew, Luke has not chosen to develop any one of these features to the exclusion of the others, the entire story is consistent with Luke's emphasis upon Jesus' miraculous acts as a manifestation of God's power.

Jairus' Daughter and the Woman with the  
Issue of Blood--Lk. 8:40-56 (Mk. 5:21-43;  
Mt. 9:18-26)

We have already observed that Matthew vigorously abbreviated the two interlocking stories in Mk. 5:21-43. Luke has likewise presented an abridged version of this Markan section, but in doing so he has retained the majority of the details of the narrative which he had before him.

---

spite of this, Luke did not omit the incident, then this--one is tempted to say--'katabasis' into 'strange parts' must have a special meaning. What is its meaning? Among other things it no doubt serves as an example of a demonstration of power outside Jewish territory, which was of fundamental importance for the Gentile mission."



The Lukan abridgement can be seen clearly both in the story of the healing of Jairus' daughter and the story of the healing of the woman with the issue of blood. In the latter story the third evangelist has used fewer words to describe the plight of the woman (v. 43--ἥτις οὐκ ἴσχυσεν ἀπ' οὐδενὸς θεραπευθῆναι), no longer mentioning that she had suffered at the hands of doctors and had spent all her savings.<sup>1</sup> Further, the action in the story takes place more swiftly than in Mark--the woman who has suffered for twelve years and has been unsuccessful in finding relief approaches Jesus from behind and touches the fringe of his garment, which results in the immediate cessation of her haemorrhage (v. 44). The conciseness of Luke's report at this point is worth noting since the third evangelist has eliminated certain Markan details. In addition to his omission of the reference to the doctors (cf. v. 43b with Mk. 5:26), Luke has not mentioned the presence of the crowd (Mk. 5:27--ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ), the fact that the woman had previously heard about Jesus (cf. Mk. 5:27), the expressed intention of

---

<sup>1</sup> P<sup>75</sup> B (D) sy<sup>s</sup> sa all omit the words ἱατροῖς προσαναλώσασα ὅλον τὸν βίον. This omission of the reference to the doctors (Mk. 5:26) has frequently been taken as an indication that Luke was a physician. Cf. Creed, p. 123, and Caird, pp. 124ff.

the woman (cf. Mk. 5:28) or the fact that the woman realized the moment of her cure (cf. Mk. 5:29b).

Although it is probable that Luke has been primarily concerned to produce a briefer narrative which would be stylistically acceptable, there is possibly another reason for certain of these changes. In Luke the woman's cure is mentioned only once (v.44b--καὶ παραχρῆμα<sup>1</sup> ἔστη ἡ ῥύσις τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς) since the words in Mk. 5:34 καὶ ἴσθι θυγῆς ἀπὸ τῆς μάστιγός σου have been deleted. Further, by means of the words ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ<sup>2</sup> the third evangelist has clearly indicated that the woman's confession was made in the presence of the crowd. It seems likely that Luke has intended both the woman's cure and her public confession to be interpreted in the light of Jesus' statement in v.48, "Daughter, your faith has made you well; go in peace." Without a doubt the phrase ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε was significant for Luke since he has not only retained it in the story of the healing of Bartimaeus (cf. 18:42 with Mk. 10:52) but has also employed it in the story of the ten lepers (cf. 17:19) and the

---

<sup>1</sup>Luke has substituted one of his favourite words, παραχρῆμα, for Mark's εὐθύς both here and in v.55 (cf. Mk. 5:29,42) and has also used it in v.47. Cf. above, p. 290.

<sup>2</sup>For Luke's use of λαός, cf. Conzelmann, p. 164.

story of the sinful woman (cf. 7:50), each of which has no Markan parallel. Since Luke has used precisely the same words in 8:48 (ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε κορεύου εἰς εἰρήνην)<sup>1</sup> as in 7:36-50, where the woman is forgiven her sins, this suggests that for Luke these words concern much more than physical healing. Σώζειν involves total salvation. This explains at least partially why the third evangelist has eliminated the occurrence of the word σωθήσεται in Mk. 5:28. The word σώζειν is most appropriately linked with πίστις as is the case in v.48.

This same theme of faith and salvation appears in the story of the healing of Jairus' daughter. In Mk. 5:23 the father kneels before Jesus and requests that Jesus come and lay his hands upon the ill girl in order that she might be saved and live (ἵνα σωθῇ καὶ ζήσῃ). In Luke, however, it is noteworthy that Jairus begs Jesus to enter his house because his only daughter is dying (vv.41,42a). Luke has omitted the Markan words σωθῇ καὶ ζήσῃ. This omission does not appear to be significant until it is noted that the third evangelist has inserted the words καὶ σωθήσεται in v.50, where after receiving the news of the girl's death, Jesus encourages Jairus not to

---

<sup>1</sup>Luke has altered only one word of Mk. 5:34a, substituting κορεύου for ὑπάγε.

fear but to believe. By adding καὶ σωθήσεται to the words μὴ φοβοῦ μόνον πιστεύσου Luke has once again demonstrated his preference for placing σώζειν and πιστεύειν in juxtaposition.<sup>1</sup> For him salvation comes through faith. At the end of the story the faith of Jairus is confirmed since his daughter is saved.

Like Matthew, Luke has eliminated the Aramaic healing word ταλιθα κουμ (Mk. 5:41) and has simply stated that Jesus declares, "Child, arise" (v.54-- ἡ καὶ, ἔγειρε). He has then reported that the girl's spirit returns to her and she arises immediately (v.55a).<sup>2</sup> Although Luke has mentioned the command of Jesus for silence (cf. v.56 with Mk. 5:43), he has differed from Mark by explicitly noting that the girl's parents were astounded at the miraculous cure (v.56).

Elsewhere in the story of the healing of Jairus' daughter Luke has made minor changes which disclose no major difference in interpretation from the Markan account. The scene at Jairus' house involving the mourners and the parents of the girl is recounted more

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Mk. 4:15 with 8:12, in which Luke has added the words ἵνα μὴ πιστεύσαντες σωθῶσιν. It is also perhaps significant that Luke has not followed Mark in using σώζειν in 21:19 (Mk. 13:13) and in 21:24 (Mk. 13:20).

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Lagrange, Luc, p. 256.

briefly. Creed has rightly pointed out that the Lukan abridgement at this point in the narrative has caused the sequence of events to be less logical (cf. vv.52-54 with Mk. 5:37-41):

Lk. summarily says that Jesus allowed no one to enter the house except the three disciples and the father and the mother of the child. This makes a much less coherent story, for the mother has not been mentioned as having gone to meet Jesus, and it is more natural that she should have remained in the house, as Mk. implies. Lk. does not say that Jesus cast out the mourners, and he does not distinguish the second room where the child lay.<sup>1</sup>

As in the case of the story of the woman, it seems likely that Luke has abbreviated the Markan account principally to shorten the narrative and has not been concerned for absolute consistency in the details. In addition, Luke alone has stated that it is the "only" daughter who is ill (v.42-- μονογενής)<sup>2</sup> and that the ruler's name is "Jairus" (v.41--'Ιάϊρος),<sup>3</sup> and, like Matthew, he has reported that it is the fringe of Jesus' garment

---

<sup>1</sup>p. 124. Cf. also Lagrange, Luc, pp. 255f., and Loisy, Évangiles Synoptiques, vol. 1, p. 824.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. 7:12 and 9:38. Luke has also reported that the girl is twelve years old but undoubtedly he has brought forward this detail from the Markan conclusion (Mk. 5:42).

<sup>3</sup>It is not at all certain that 'Ιάϊρος is the original reading in Mk. 5:22 since Bezae (D) and most of the Old Latin witnesses as well as the Matthean account do not contain it. Cf. Bultmann, History, p. 215.



(v.44--τοῦ κρασπέδου)<sup>1</sup> which the unclean woman touches.

Undoubtedly these two miracle stories were primarily important to Luke because they provided additional illustrations of Jesus' power to heal and even to restore the dead. We have already noted that the healing of the Gerasene demoniac (8:26-39) stands as an exception in the Lukan portrayal of Jesus' ministry since it occurs outside of Galilee.<sup>2</sup> In that instance, it was observed that the people of this Gentile territory choose to have nothing to do with Jesus, the miracle worker, because they fear him. It is perhaps in the light of this rejection of Jesus that Luke has specifically noted that the Galilean crowd is expecting Jesus and warmly welcomes him at his return (v.40--'Εν δὲ τῷ ὑποστρέφειν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπεδέξατο αὐτὸν ὁ ὄχλος ἦσαν γὰρ πάντες προσδοκῶντες αὐτόν).<sup>3</sup> In this way

---

<sup>1</sup>At this point both Luke and Matthew have agreed over against Mark (see Mt. 9:20). In addition, there are other correspondences in this story between Luke and Matthew--ἰδοὺ . . . ἄρχων (8:41 and Mt. 9:18) and θυγάτηρ (8:42 and Mt. 9:18). Such agreements do not necessarily presuppose dependency since they could have arrived at these changes quite independently.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. above, pp. 280f.

<sup>3</sup>ἀποδέχεσθαι occurs only here and in 9:11 in addition to five times in Acts. Also προσδοκᾶν is a word used more frequently by Luke (six times in the Gospel and five times in Acts) than in the rest of the New Testament (cf. Mt. 11:3 and 24:50; II Pet. 3:12,13,14.).

the third evangelist has not only created a striking contrast to the previous pericope (8:37) but also has prepared for the two incidents in which both Jairus and the woman exhibit expectant faith. In other words, it is in Galilee that the people expected things to happen because of Jesus' power. In fact, in v.46 Luke has indicated that Jesus directly speaks about this power which went out from him.<sup>1</sup> Regarding this change Held states:

The observation that a δύναμις has gone out of the miracle-worker is not made by the narrator but by Jesus himself (Luke 8:46). Jesus thus designates himself as the bearer of a mysterious "power".<sup>2</sup>

Our above investigation has revealed the following factors: Luke has made certain alterations of the Markan account for stylistic reasons, in some places abbreviating it while elsewhere adding various details; the third evangelist has taken care to relate the theme of salvation with that of faith since for him it is trust in the person

---

<sup>1</sup>It is to be noted that Luke has described in direct speech Jesus' awareness that power has departed from him, but he has done so after Jesus' first inquiry has been answered. Here Peter, not the disciples (see Mk. 5:31), responds to Jesus after all the others had denied it (v.45--ἀπονομένων δὲ πάντων εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος . . . ). Cf. 22:8, in which Luke has also added the name Peter (plus John), and 22:46, from which he has omitted it.

<sup>2</sup>P. 218.

and word of Jesus which results in total salvation; and finally, like Mark, he has viewed these two stories as demonstrations of Jesus' power. The story of the healing of the woman provides a specific example in Luke of that which is mentioned in his general summary of Jesus' healings, "And all the crowd sought to touch him, for power came forth from him and healed them all" (6:19). Jesus' power can even overcome death as has already been demonstrated in the story of the raising of the widow's son at Nain (7:11-17).

The Feeding of the Five Thousand--  
Lk. 9:10-17 (Mk. 6:30-44; Mt. 14:13-21)

Since Luke has omitted both the report of John the Baptist's death (Mk. 6:17-29) and a longer section in the second Gospel (Mk. 6:45-8:26), his version of the feeding of the 5000 is bracketed by pericopae in which the major issue concerns the identity of Jesus. The passage concerning Herod's perplexity about the person of Jesus (9:7-9) precedes the feeding narrative, and the pericope recounting the confession of Peter follows (9:18-22). It would appear that the third evangelist has deliberately drawn out the parallelism between

9:7-9 and 9:18-22,<sup>1</sup> perhaps intending Peter's words to be the answer to Herod's question--Jesus is "the Christ of God" (v.20--τὸν χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ).<sup>2</sup> Given this altered context in the third Gospel, we might expect that Jesus' miraculous feeding of the 5000 would here have definite revelatory significance for Luke, especially since it is no longer linked with the misunderstanding of the disciples.<sup>3</sup>

As in Mark, the Lukan narrative commences with the observation that the apostles<sup>4</sup> return from their mission (cf. 9:1-6), but it is indicated directly that Jesus withdraws with his disciples into a lonely spot.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>For example, Luke has inserted the words τις τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη into 9:19, thus providing a parallel to the phrase in 9:8.

<sup>2</sup>Both 8:20 and 23:35 are perhaps intended by Luke to stress the functional aspect of Jesus' Messiahship. Cf. Hahn, p. 224. It should be noted that in Mk. 8:29 Peter's confession is σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός and that Matthew in 16:16 has added the words ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Fuller, Miracles, p. 86.

<sup>4</sup>In the second Gospel the designation ἀπόστολος occurs only in 6:30 and possibly in 3:14, but it appears more frequently in Luke (cf. 6:13; 17:5; 22:14; 24:10) and, of course, numerous times in the book of Acts.

<sup>5</sup>Although in v.12 it is assumed that Jesus and his disciples are in a deserted place (ὅτι ὧδε ἐν ἐρήμῳ τόπῳ ἐσμέν), Luke has indicated at the outset of the pericope that they withdraw "apart to a city called Bethsaida" (v.10). The numerous variant readings disclose the

Having omitted Mk. 6:31, which suggests that the traffic of the people prevents the disciples from having time to eat, and Mk. 6:32f., which report that Jesus and his disciples depart in a boat and that the crowd precedes them on foot to the place where they are to land, Luke has introduced the crowd with the following words, "When the crowds learned it [that Jesus has withdrawn to Bethsaida] , they followed him; and he welcomed them and spoke to them of the Kingdom of God, and cured those who had need of healing" (v.11). In 8:40 the third evangelist has employed ἀποδέχεσθαι to describe the crowd's warm reception of Jesus when he returned from the

---

apparent incongruity of this Lukan geographical reference. Most commentators (Creed, p. 128; Leaney, p. 161; Gilmour, I.B., vol. 8, p. 166; Grundmann, Lukas, p. 186; Lagrange, Luc, p. 262; Loisy, Évangiles Synoptiques, vol. 1, p. 931) assume that the third evangelist has brought forward into the feeding narrative the reference in Mk. 6:45 to this city. Streeter, pp. 176ff., in particular, has put forth a rather ingenious hypothesis that Luke possessed a mutilated text of Mark which broke off after the words αὐτὸς μόνος in Mk. 6:47 and then began again with the words καὶ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐκπηρῶτα in 8:27. According to Streeter, this would explain why Luke has not mentioned Caesarea Philippi in 9:18ff. since he would have concluded that both the feeding incident and the confession of Peter occurred in or around Bethsaida. Cf. Conzelmann, pp. 51ff., who suggests that Streeter has failed to take into account the role of "the lake" in the third Gospel and the evangelist's consistent deletion of "Decapolis." Finally, cf. Schmidt, pp. 211f., who speculates about the etymology of the name "Bethsaida" (as meaning "Speisehaus") and its connexion with the story of the feeding of the 5000.



territory of the Gerasenes. In this instance, the mention of Jesus' welcome of the people seems to be Luke's replacement for Mark's reference to the compassion of Jesus (Mk. 6:34).<sup>1</sup> In Mark we are given the impression that Jesus is attempting to avoid the crowds and only teaches them because of their desperate need (they were as sheep without a shepherd), but in Luke the scene is differently portrayed. It is customary for the crowds to follow Jesus; he expects it and welcomes them, speaking to them of the Kingdom of God<sup>2</sup> and healing their sick. Lagrange notes this difference in emphasis when he states:

Dans Lc., l'intention de retraite, moins apparente, n'est pas tenue en échec par l'obstination de la foule, et si Jésus l'instruit, ce n'est pas parce que la compassion l'emporte sur son désir de solitude; il fait son office de docteur et ensuite de thaumaturge.<sup>3</sup>

Thus it can be seen that the third evangelist has neglected certain Markan details in order to picture Jesus as acting more openly with the crowd in his Messianic functions of teaching and healing. The disciples

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. above, p. 322.

<sup>2</sup>Mark has not specified what Jesus teaches (Mk. 6:34). Cf. Conzelmann, pp. 113ff., for the meaning of the phrase ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ in Luke's Gospel.

<sup>3</sup>Luc, p. 261.

were just commissioned by Jesus to perform the same tasks (cf. 9:2,6), and in 10:9 it is indicated that the seventy heal the sick and announce the presence of the Kingdom of God.

The central portion of the Markan feeding narrative has been altered to some extent by Luke (cf. 9:12-17 with Mk. 6:35-44). As in Mark, the disciples (v.12--οἱ δώδεκα) call Jesus' attention to the fact that the people should be dismissed so that they can secure lodgings and food (cf. v.12b with Mk. 6:36), and Jesus replies to them by commanding, "You give them something to eat" (v.13). According to Mark, the disciples respond to this order by indicating how much money would be required to purchase the necessary food to feed the crowd (Mk. 6:37), all of which prompts Jesus to ask them to find out what food supplies are available in that place. After going to see, they then report to him that there are five loaves and two fish (Mk. 6:38). Luke has condensed this scene and indicates that the disciples answer Jesus' original question by saying, "We have no more than five loaves and two fish--unless we are to go and buy food for all these people" (v.13b).<sup>1</sup> In other

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. van Iersel, op. cit., p. 190.

words, according to Luke, the disciples immediately know the extent of the supplies and realize that they are insufficient to feed the multitude. It would appear that in v.14a Luke has noted the approximate size of the crowd (ἦσαν γὰρ ὡσεὶ ἄνδρες πενταχίλιοι)<sup>1</sup> to show the reason for the disciples' comment and to emphasize the enormity of the miracle which Jesus was about to accomplish.<sup>2</sup>

Luke has quite faithfully repeated the Markan words which recount Jesus' action of blessing and breaking the bread and fish prior to their distribution to the multitude. He has merely replaced τοὺς ἄρτους (Mk. 6:41) with αὐτούς (v.16) and eliminated the words καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἐμέρισεν πᾶσιν (Mk. 6:41), all of which permits him to picture the blessing and breaking of the bread and fish as one action. As a result, it corresponds more closely to the practice of blessing and breaking the bread during the celebration of the Eucharist in the early

---

<sup>1</sup>Mark has not reported the number of people fed by Jesus until the end of the narrative (Mk. 6:44).

<sup>2</sup>Grundmann, Lukas, p. 187, says, "Die Zahl der Volksmenge wird von ihm sofort im Anschluss an die Worte der Jünger genannt und nicht wie bei Markus und Matthäus gegen Ende der Erzählung nach der erfolgten Speisung. Dadurch soll die Spannung auf das Bevorstehende erhöht werden."

Church.<sup>1</sup>

As we have seen, Luke has abbreviated this Markan feeding narrative, and in so doing he has sharpened, at least to some extent, the Christological meaning of this incident. Jesus welcomes the crowd and proceeds to speak to them about the Kingdom of God and to heal their sick; then assisted by his disciples Jesus is pictured feeding the crowd. The disciples' food supplies are inadequate but in Jesus' hands they are miraculously multiplied. By his abridgement of Mark, Luke has placed the story of the feeding, that of Peter's confession, and the account of the Transfiguration in rapid succession. In each case, Jesus is clearly revealed as the chosen one of God. This is the very same one who shortly must begin his journey to Jerusalem (9:51).<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. 22:19 and 24:30. It should be noted that Luke has used εὐχαριστήσας in 22:19 rather than εὐλογήσας. In addition, van Iersel, *op. cit.*, p. 173, thinks that Luke's use of the phrase ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤρξατο κλινεῖν (v.12) and his substitution of the κατακλίνειν (vv.14f.) for Mark's ἀνακλίνειν (Mk. 6:39) brings the feeding narrative into closer agreement with 24:29f., which has Eucharistic significance.

<sup>2</sup>Conzelmann, p. 56, supposes that the same crowd is intended in 9:23ff. as in the feeding narrative and concludes that " . . . the sayings in vv.23ff. stand in strong contrast to the 'glory' that was seen in the miracle . . . " Whether or not the same crowd is meant in both pericopae is not certain since the

The Healing of the Epileptic Child--

Lk. 9:37-43a (Mk. 9:14-29; Mt. 17:14-20)

Like Matthew, Luke has radically abbreviated the Markan account of the healing of the epileptic boy, but it is obvious that he has done so for a different reason. Matthew's alteration of Mark has highlighted the theme of discipleship as is seen particularly in his addition of Mt. 17:20.<sup>1</sup> Luke, on the other hand, has shown far more concern to emphasize the miracle itself as a marvelous act of Jesus, which causes the people to be amazed at the greatness of God (v.43). Luke has achieved this emphasis not only by eliminating certain sections of the Markan story but also by inserting a new conclusion.

The Lukan version of this miracle story commences with a chronological reference different from that in Mark since the third evangelist has omitted the section describing the discussion held during the descent from the mountain about the return of Elijah (Mk. 9:9-13;

---

episode in vv.18ff. involving only Jesus and the disciples intervenes. In any case, it seems clear that Luke has intended the feeding miracle to be linked closely not only with the words in vv.18ff. but also with the Transfiguration (9:28-36), which also points to the Passion of Jesus in Jerusalem.

<sup>1</sup>For the consideration of Mt. 17:14-20, see above, pp. 239-245.



cf. Mt. 17:9-13).<sup>1</sup> As a result, the story of the healing follows directly after the account of the Transfiguration. Luke has employed the following words to form the transition: "On the next day, when they [Jesus and the three disciples] had come down from the mountain, a great crowd met him" (v.37). He has indicated that the incident takes place on "the next day" (τῇ ἑξῆς ἡμέρᾳ) since he has apparently assumed that the Transfiguration occurred at night.<sup>2</sup>

Further, since Luke has made no reference to the debate between the nine disciples and the scribes, which in Mark accounts for the formation of the crowd (Mk. 9:14-16), he must introduce the crowd immediately in v.37 without explanation. At first the reader is left with the impression that the people have assembled merely as a consequence of Jesus' appearance, but then in v.40 another reason for their presence is given. The father indicates that the disciples failed to heal

---

<sup>1</sup>Conzelmann, p. 59, says the following regarding this omission: "The conversation during the descent is omitted, and together with it the idea of Elijah as the forerunner is suppressed. Luke's conception of the eschatological drama has no room for this idea."

<sup>2</sup>This is suggested by the Lukan expansion in 9:32, in which he has indicated that the disciples who accompanied Jesus up the mountain were heavy with sleep. Cf. 6:12, in which Jesus is also praying at night. Cf. Conzelmann, pp. 58f.

his boy. By being faithful to the Markan account at this point, Luke has presumed that Jesus' other nine disciples are present with the crowd. Nevertheless, it is clear that the third evangelist is far less concerned to explain why the disciples are there than to introduce the father and his request. In much the same way as he has introduced the leper in 5:12, Luke has drawn attention to the father (ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος) who immediately cries out from the midst of the crowd and says, "Teacher, I beg you to look upon my son, for he is my only child; and behold, a spirit seizes him, and he suddenly cries out; it convulses him till he foams, and shatters him [wears him out], and will hardly leave him. And I begged your disciples to cast it out, but they could not" (vv. 38-40).

As elsewhere (7:12 and 8:42), the third evangelist has reported that it is an only child (v.38b--ὅτι μονογενὴς μοί ἐστιν), thus dramatizing the plea of the father. In addition, it should be observed that Luke has given only one description of the boy's illness<sup>1</sup> while in Mk. 9:21f. the second evangelist has included a second description

---

<sup>1</sup>It should be noted that in v.39 Luke has not copied Mark's words (cf. Mk. 9:18,21f.) but has rewritten them in a more logical progression.

of the effect which the evil spirit has upon the boy.

After Jesus responds to the man's request by issuing the general indictment against the generation of faithless men (v.41a), he commands the father to bring his son to him (v.41b). As the boy is being brought to Jesus, the demon<sup>1</sup> throws the boy down and causes a convulsion. Unlike Mark, however, Luke has not suggested that it is the sight of Jesus which causes the demon to behave in this manner. In rapid succession the third evangelist has recounted Jesus' rebuke of the unclean spirit (v.42b), the healing of the child and his return to his father (v.42c).<sup>2</sup> Finally, it should be noted that Luke has employed ἰάσατο to replace the longer description in Mk. 9:25f. of the expulsion of the evil spirit which leaves the boy as dead and necessitates Jesus' taking his hand and raising him up (Mk. 9:27). It would appear that Luke has not wanted to picture the expulsion and the healing as two distinct actions.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Luke has substituted τὸ δαιμόνιον for Mark's τὸ πνεῦμα.

<sup>2</sup>In the raising of the widow's son at Nain, Luke has also concluded the miracle by reporting that Jesus gave the young man to his mother (7:15).

<sup>3</sup>Plummer, p. 255, e.g., states, "The expulsion of the demon left the boy in a condition which still required healing. Lk. gives each act separately." Thus

As a concluding verse Luke has appended the words ἐξεπλήρουντο δὲ πάντες ἐπὶ τῇ μεγαλειότητι<sup>1</sup> τοῦ θεοῦ (v.43), by which he has emphasized the effect which Jesus' miracle has upon all. As elsewhere (5:25f.; 7:16; 13:13; 17:15; 18:43) the miracle effected by Jesus is seen as a revelation of God.

Richardson concludes that Luke's altered version exhibits the typical pattern of the miracle story far more closely than does the Markan account. He says,

If the Form-Critics based their judgments upon "form" alone, they would have to maintain that the Lucan story of the Epileptic Boy is the original, for it exhibits the miracle-story form to perfection. It concludes, as Mark does not, with an expression of astonishment on the part of the bystanders: "They were astonished at the majesty (μεγαλειότητι) of God" (Lk. 9:43). This conclusion is a more categorical affirmation of the meaning of the miracle of Jesus than anything which we find in Mark.<sup>2</sup>

While concentrating upon the miracle itself, Luke has neglected the discipleship theme which appears in

---

also Leaney, p. 169. Cf., however, Lagrange, Luc, p. 277, who concludes that Luke has not intended to differentiate carefully between the exorcism and the healing. Cf. also 6:18, in which Luke has simply described the healing of the people possessed by unclean spirits as one process.

<sup>1</sup>This word occurs only here, in Acts 19:27 and in II Pet. 1:17. In the last instance it is used to describe the Transfiguration of Jesus.

<sup>2</sup>P. 108.

the Markan account and which is brought out especially by the redaction of Matthew. As we have already mentioned, the third evangelist has noted the failure of the disciples to cast out the evil spirit. This is directly followed by Jesus' indictment, ὧ γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη,<sup>1</sup> ἕως πότε ἔσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ ἀνέξομαι ὑμῶν; (v.41). Luke has completely eliminated, however, Jesus' conversation with the father in which the man confesses his unbelief (Mk. 9:23f.) as well as Mk. 9:28f., in which the reader's attention is focused upon the inability of the disciples to cast out the evil spirit. In Mark the father's statement--"I believe; help my unbelief!"--is probably intended as another example of the generation which Jesus has just previously designated as "unbelieving"; thus, both the disciples' failure and the doubt of the father are symptomatic of the situation in which Jesus carries out his ministry. In Luke, however, Jesus' indictment seems to be somewhat out of place and could only be linked with his one reference to the failure of the disciples. This leads us to conclude that Luke was not primarily interested in the cause of the disciples' failure to cast out the

---

<sup>1</sup>By using διεστραμμένη Luke has agreed with Mt. 17:17 over against Mark.



demon as his omission of Mk. 9:28f. demonstrates. Luke has evidently not intended this pericope as a guide to those persons who exercised a ministry of healing in the early Church.

It does not seem likely, as it is sometimes suggested,<sup>1</sup> that by his omission of Mk. 9:28f. the third evangelist has deliberately spared the reputation of the disciples. Rather, it would seem that his concern to highlight Jesus' miracle itself has caused him to neglect the issue involving the failure of the disciples.

We can thus conclude that Luke's major abridgement of the Markan account, coupled with his substitution of a different conclusion, has tended to stress the action of Jesus as a marvellous deed which prompts the astonished witnesses to praise God. Nonetheless, it must be noted that the latter half of v.43, in which the reaction of amazement caused by Jesus' action is again mentioned (πάντων δὲ θαυμάζοντων ἐπὶ πάντιν οἷς ἐποίησεν), introduces Jesus' second reference to the Passion (9:43b-45). Already, following the Markan order, Luke has pictured Jesus' prediction of his Passion subsequent to the confession of Peter (9:21ff.) but, in addition, he has introduced

---

<sup>1</sup>Thus Plummer, p. 255; Manson, Luke, p. 116; Leaney, p. 169.

this same motif into the Transfiguration narrative (v.31-- οἱ ὀφθέντες ἐν δόξῃ ἔλεγον τὴν ἑξοδὸν αὐτοῦ, ἣν ἤμελλεν πληροῦν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ).<sup>1</sup> In other words, in the healing of the epileptic boy Luke has emphasized the manifestation of God's majesty, but he has done so in close association with the announcement of Jesus' Passion. Although, for Luke, the miracles of Jesus disclose the power of God, it will be his suffering and death which will reveal God's purpose at an even more profound level.

The Healing of the Woman with a Spirit of Infirmary--Lk. 13:10-17

This miracle story, in which the sabbath controversy theme emerges, is from Luke's special material. Earlier in his Gospel he has reproduced the two Markan narratives which relate directly to this theme (cf. 6:1-11 with Mk. 2:23-3:6), and the reappearance of the theme at this place seems somewhat abrupt. It is not at all clear why Luke has inserted 13:10-17 into its present context unless he has, in fact, preserved a unit of material

---

<sup>1</sup>Conzelmann, p. 57, declares, "The purpose behind the heavenly manifestation is the announcement of the Passion, and by this means the proof is given that the Passion is something decreed by God."

(13:1-17) which was in his source.<sup>1</sup> Although there are certain signs of Lukan redaction in this pericope,<sup>2</sup> it does seem likely that 13:10-17 was first put into writing by the third evangelist.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Creed, p. 182, and Lagrange, Luc, p. 381, who suggest that there might be a connexion between 13:10-17 and the preceding section (13:6-9) which is concerned with the impenitence and opposition of Israel. We must reject Loisy's allegorization (Évangiles Synoptiques, vol. 2, p. 117) in which he follows certain of the Church fathers and interprets the crippled woman to be the early Church finally liberated from the oppression of the synagogue.

<sup>2</sup>Conzelmann, p. 223, assumes that the reference in v.10 to Jesus' teaching in the synagogue is editorial. In addition, it is possible that the following are the result of Luke's redaction: παραχρημα (it appears ten times in Luke and six times in Acts); και εδοξαζεν τον θεον (cf. 2:20; 5:25f.; 7:16; 17:15; 18:43; 23:47; Acts 4:21; 11:18; 13:48; 21:20); ο κυριος (cf. 7:19; 10:1,39,41; 11:39; 12:42; 13:15; 17:5,6; 18:6; 19:8; 22:61; 24:3); and the words in v.17b (cf. 19:37 with Mk. 11:8; χαριεν appears frequently in the special Lukan material--1:14,28; 10:20; 15:5,32; 19:6; 23:8; cf. Bultmann, History, pp. 12f.).

<sup>3</sup>Richardson, pp. 110f., seems to favour the conclusion that the third evangelist himself has constructed 13:10-17 along with the other four special miracle stories (5:1-11; 7:11-17; 14:1-6; 17:11-19). Contrary to his opinion that there is insufficient evidence in the vocabulary to support the conclusion that all these stories came from a special source, it should be noted that certain words which occur in 13:10-17 are not used with any regularity by Luke and, therefore, might be attributed to a written source: συνκνυειν (only here in the New Testament); εις το παντελες (v.11 and Heb. 7:25); ανωρθωεν (v.13, Acts 15:16 and Heb. 12:12); αναπαυειν (used only here in v.14 by Luke but three times in Mark and three times in Matthew); κατασχυνειν (only in v.17 in Luke but three times

Like 6:6-11, this pericope reports a healing which takes place on the sabbath in a Jewish synagogue, but it is to be observed that 13:10-17 is not really an integral unit. For example, in 13:10-17 no mention of the conflict is made until after the woman is healed by Jesus and she praises God for her cure (v.13--*καὶ ἐδόξαζεν τὸν θεόν*). It is then that the question about a sabbath healing is posed by the ruler of the synagogue (vv.14ff.). In other words, vv.10-13 in themselves present us with a complete miracle story--the condition of the woman is described; Jesus sees her need and calls her to himself; he announces that she is liberated from her infirmity and lays his hands upon her; her health is immediately restored; and finally the woman praises God.

13:10-13 does vary from the usual miracle story pattern since it includes no request for the healing and portrays Jesus as the one who initiates the action.<sup>1</sup> In addition, it contains no conversation between Jesus and the patient nor any indication of the woman's faith.

---

in Rom., seven times in I and II Cor., and two times in I Pet.).

<sup>1</sup>It should be recalled that this was also the case in 7:11-17.

All in all, it is significant that this simple miracle story has evidently not been appreciably altered to fit the sabbath observance theme. Rather, it appears to exist as an independent unit to which the sabbath controversy has been appended at some stage in its transmission. In light of this fact, it might be legitimately assumed that for the third evangelist the story of the miracle was important not merely as a preparation for the sabbath controversy but also for its own sake. Further support for such a conclusion is found in the final statement in v.17b, " . . . and all the people rejoiced at all the glorious things that were done by him," since these words do not seem to refer exclusively to Jesus' triumph over his opponents recounted in vv.14-17a. Luke has probably intended the miracles, including this one, to be counted among the "glorious things" (τὰς ἐνδόξους) which were accomplished by Jesus.

This is not to suggest that the sabbath controversy was unimportant to Luke, but it is to insist that there is no evidence to support the conclusion that he has wanted to subordinate the reported miracle, emphasizing only the sabbath theme.

In the latter part of the pericope reference is



again made to the woman who is healed, but in this instance she is referred to as " . . . a daughter of Abraham<sup>1</sup> whom Satan bound for eighteen years . . . " (v.16). In view of this reference to Satan's binding as well as the earlier description of the woman's malady in terms of a spirit of weakness (v.11--πνεῦμα ἔχονσα ἀσθενείας), it seems probable that the third evangelist has here seen in the woman's sickness the work of the demonic. Even if the reference to Satan came to Luke in his source, he has certainly assumed that there is some relationship between the evil spirits and Satan; for him Jesus' victory over Satan (4:1-13; 11:20-22) demonstrates that Jesus has the power to restore one who was incapacitated under the adversary's rule.<sup>2</sup>

Jesus' argument for the appropriateness of his healing of this woman on the sabbath is established by his reference to the care given by his opponents to animals on a sabbath. After the ruler of the synagogue declares to the people, "There are six days on which

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. 19:9. Conzelmann, p. 166, states, "The fact that Abraham is more prominent in Luke than in Mark is a result of sources."

<sup>2</sup>For Luke's interpretation of the role of Satan in the ministry of Jesus, cf. Conzelmann, pp. 156f.

work ought to be done; come on those days and be healed, and not on the sabbath day" (v.14--cf. Exod. 20:9f.; Deut. 5:13f.), Jesus addresses a question to his adversaries, "You hypocrites! Does not each of you on the sabbath untie his ox or his ass from the manger, and lead it away to water it?" (v.15).<sup>1</sup> A similar saying, regarding an animal which has fallen into a pit, has been employed by Matthew in 12:11 and by Luke in 14:5,<sup>2</sup> and in each case the argument is from the lesser to the greater good. In this particular case, the saying in v.15 provides the lead-in to v.16, the two verses being linked by means of the catchword, λύειν (λύει . . . λυθῆναι); if they trouble to "loose" their animals on a sabbath to allow them to drink, should this woman not also be "loosed" from her infirmity on the sabbath?<sup>3</sup> Although only the ruler of the synagogue (v.14--ὁ ἀρχισυνάγωγος) speaks to the crowd, it is reported that all Jesus' opponents were put to shame (v.17a--πάντες οἱ ἀντικείμενοι αὐτῷ). Then, in contrast, the crowd responds in a

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Strack-Billerbeck, vol. 2, pp. 199f.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. above, pp. 204f., and below, p. 367.

<sup>3</sup>Creed, p. 183, comments, "The analogy between 'loosing' cattle from the stall (λύει) and 'loosing' the woman from her infirmity (λυθῆναι) strikes the reader as a trifle forced and artificial."

positive fashion to the words and deeds of Jesus (v.17b).

In the light of the above observations, it can be concluded that the miracle of healing recounted in 13:10-17 has been somewhat artificially linked to the discussion about the breaking of the sabbath regulations. It has not become merely auxiliary to this other theme since many characteristics of the miracle story are still present. We have noted that the final reaction of the crowd (v.17b) is not focused exclusively on Jesus' victory over his opponents concerning the sabbath issue but also on the "glorious things" [miracles?] which Jesus has accomplished. This Lukan pericope provides a demonstration of Jesus' power over sickness, and therefore Satan, as well as his authority over the sabbath. The purpose of Jesus' healing complements rather than contradicts God's design for the sabbath.<sup>1</sup>

The Healing of the Man with the Dropsy--Lk. 14:1-6

Like 13:10-17, 14:1-6 is a sabbath controversy story for which there is no direct parallel in any other Gospel. The third evangelist has either drawn this material from a written source available to him

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Fuller, Miracles, pp. 64f.

or has put this story in writing for the first time.<sup>1</sup>  
In either case, we are obviously dealing with a miracle story which has been formulated on the basis of the

---

<sup>1</sup>An analysis of the vocabulary in 14:1-6 seems to support the latter suggestion since it contains a number of phrases and words which are probably Lukan: v.1-- καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ (cf. Plummer, p. 45); v.1-- καὶ αὐτοὶ ἦσαν (cf. Plummer, p. 354); v.1-- παρατηρούμενοι (παρατηρεῖν appears in the New Testament also in 6:7, which parallels Mk. 3:2; 20:20, which is probably redactional; Acts 9:24 and Gal. 4:10); v.3-- νομικός (νομικός occurs only in Mt. 22:35 (10:25) other than in 7:30; 11:45,46,52); v.3-- ἡσυχάσαν (ἡσυχάζειν appears twice in Luke--14:3 and 23:56, the latter being redactional; twice in Acts--11:18 and 21:14; and in I Thess. 4:11); v.5-- ἐπιλαβόμενος (this occurs five times in Luke, seven times in Acts and also in Mt. 14:31; Mk. 8:23; I Tim. 6:12,19; Heb. 2:16 and 8:9; Luke has substituted it for another Markan word in 9:47, 20:20 and 23:26; cf. also 20:26, where it seems to be the result of Luke's redaction); v.5-- ἰάσατο (this occurs eleven times in Luke and four times in Acts but only four times in Matthew, once in Mark and three times in John; 5:17; 6:18,19; 8:47; 9:2,11,42; and 22:51 appear to be redactional while 7:7 parallels Mt. 8:8; 17:15, like 14:5, occurs in special Lukan material). Certain other words, however, occur only in 14:1-6 or infrequently in the New Testament. Ὑδρωπικός is found only here (v.2); ἀνασπαύειν only occurs here (v.6) and in Acts 11:10; φρέαρ is used only here (v.5), twice in John and three times in Rev.; and ἀνταποκρίνεσθαι appears only here (v.6) and in Rom. 9:20. This possibly suggests that Luke was here using a special written source unless he was employing particular words which are essential to the story and are not pressed into service elsewhere. In any case, the question of Lukan authorship of 14:1-6 cannot be easily decided merely on the basis of vocabulary. Cf. Bultmann, History, p. 12, who supposes that 14:1-6 has developed as a framework for the saying in v.5. Undoubtedly, he would assume this process occurred in the pre-Lukan stage since he assigns only v.1 to Luke's redaction.

theme of the violation of the sabbath. For this reason, 14:1-6 actually parallels Mk. 3:1-6 (6:6-11) more closely than 13:10-17 since in the latter pericope the miracle story has retained its independent form. As in Mk. 3:1-6, the healing of the man serves as a demonstration of Jesus' authority over the sabbath and of his triumph over the scribes (v.3--νομικοῦς) and Pharisees. It cannot be stated with certainty that Luke had this other story (Mk. 3:1-6 in 6:6-11) in mind when he included 14:1-6 in his Gospel although it should be noted that the verb παρατηρεῖν, which appears in v.1, occurs in the second Gospel only in 3:2 (6:7) and that the words in Mk. 3:2 following παρατήρουν are: εἰ τοῖς σάββασιν θεραπεύσαι. At least, it is possible that both παρατηρούμενοι in v.1<sup>1</sup> and the words in Jesus' question ἔξεστιν τῷ σαββάτῳ θεραπεύσαι ἢ οὐ in v.3 are reminiscent of the Markan story.<sup>2</sup> Even if this is not the case,

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Richardson, p. 113, and Loisy, Évangiles Synoptiques, vol. 2, p. 129, who draw attention to this possible borrowing from Mk. 3:2.

<sup>2</sup>It should be admitted, however, that the formal question of Jesus in Mk. 3:4 does not exhibit exact verbal agreement with the question in v.3: ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν ἀγαθὸν ποιῆσαι (6:9--ἀγαθοποιῆσαι) ἢ κακοποιῆσαι, ψυχὴν σῶσαι ἢ ἀποκτεῖναι (6:9--ἀπολέσαι). It is possible that Luke considered the verb θεραπεύειν to be more appropriate to 14:1-6.



14:1-6 does, in fact, present us with a story which develops the sabbath controversy theme in a manner similar to Mk. 3:1-6.

Unlike Mk. 3:1-6, however, this story takes place not in the synagogue but in the house of one of the leaders among the Pharisees (τινος τῶν ἀρχόντων τῶν<sup>1</sup> φαρισαίων). This Lukan setting seems to be somewhat less suitable than the Markan one for a sabbath controversy. After the rather abrupt report that "they were watching him" (v.1), the man with the dropsy is mentioned. At that moment Jesus addresses this question to the lawyers and Pharisees, who have not been mentioned prior to this time: "Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath, or not?" In other words, by means of the clause at the end of v.1 (καὶ αὐτοὶ ἦσαν παρατηρούμενοι αὐτόν) and Jesus' direct question regarding the legality of sabbath healing (v.3), the principal issue of the pericope is brought into the foreground.

Although in 6:9 Luke has omitted Mark's reference to the silence of Jesus' opponents (cf. Mk. 3:4), he has mentioned this feature here (v.4--οἱ δὲ ἠσύχασαν). Jesus heals the man and dismisses him; only then does

---

<sup>1</sup>It should be noted that the τῶν is omitted in P<sup>45.75</sup> B S.

he again speak to his opponents. The story concludes with another reference to the subdued and silent condition of Jesus' opponents, "And they could not reply to this" (v.6).<sup>1</sup>

Before concluding, we should note that the saying in v.5 is similar to the one which appears in Mt. 12:11, both of them possibly coming from a common tradition.<sup>2</sup> As in Mt. 12:11f. and Lk. 13:15f., the Pharisees' concern for their own possessions is contrasted with their apparent unconcern for human beings in need on a sabbath. This is the basis for Jesus' indictment of his opponents.

Unlike 13:10-17, 14:1-6 exhibits few of the features of the typical miracle story but is a more closely knit unit which focuses almost exclusively on the question of the sabbath healing. In addition, it does not conclude with a choral response highlighting the

---

<sup>1</sup>Plummer, p. 356, asserts, "Lk. is fond of noting that people are silenced or keep silence (20:26; Acts 11:18, 12:17, 15:12, 22:2)."

<sup>2</sup>Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, p. 126, concludes that the saying in v.5 contained a play on words in the Aramaic and that the word *vîôc*, which seems to be ill-placed in this context, is in fact a misreading of *b<sup>e</sup> 'ira*. See also Haenchen, Der Weg, pp. 126f. Cf. above, pp. 204f.

effect of Jesus' miracle upon the witnesses.<sup>1</sup> Instead, the miracle of healing itself plays a lesser role in the narrative--the man with dropsy appears, is subsequently healed by Jesus' contact with him (ἐπιλαβόμενος) and then is dismissed. Like Mk. 3:1-6, 14:1-6 approximates far more nearly the pattern of the pronouncement story<sup>2</sup> than that of the miracle story since its major emphasis is on the theme of sabbath observance.

The Healing of the Ten Lepers--  
Lk. 17:11-19

The story of the ten lepers, peculiar to Luke's Gospel, takes place in an unspecified village during the course of Jesus' journey to Jerusalem (vv.11f.).<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Rengstorff, p. 179, perhaps correctly concludes, "Von einem Preis Gottes über dem Geschehenen (13,17) wird diesmal nichts gesagt, und das ist verständlich, da--anders als in der Synagoge--im Privathause eines Pharisäers eine Jesus zugetane Volksmenge nicht zu erwarten ist."

<sup>2</sup>Both Bultmann, History, pp. 12,62, and Dibelius, p. 43, place 14:1-6 in this general category.

<sup>3</sup>It seems that there is reason to doubt the historical exactness of Luke's geographical references in v.11. Conzelmann, pp. 68ff., like most commentators (see, e.g., Bultmann, History, p. 33, and Grundmann, Lukas, p. 334) assumes that v.11 is partially or entirely redactional. He suggests that Luke's ignorance of Palestine accounts for the strange combination of Samaria and Galilee in v.11. Cf. Schmidt, pp. 261ff., who among other things notes the difficulty which this geographical reference caused interpreters in the

It is frequently held that 17:11-19 is an adaptation, made perhaps in the Hellenistic Church, of the story of the cleansing of the leper in Mk. 1:40-45 (5:12-16),<sup>1</sup> but there is also reason to suppose that the story circulated in the Palestinian Church since it presupposes a definite Jewish viewpoint.<sup>2</sup> In their present forms Mk. 1:40-45 and 17:11-19 correspond only in certain general features, and this fact does not necessarily suggest that the Lukan story was formed on the basis of the Markan one at some stage in the tradition. Luke has probably incorporated the story of the ten lepers into his Gospel because it dramatically contrasts the thankfulness of the Samaritan, a foreigner, with the ingratitude of the other nine lepers. Although, as

---

earliest time of the Church. He states, "Dieser Variantennest [variant readings] zeigt klar, dass man schon im Altertum die Topographie von 17,11 nicht verstanden hat." Cf. finally, Grundmann, Lukas, pp. 335f., who lists certain other attempted solutions to this problem of geography.

<sup>1</sup>Bultmann, History, pp. 33,239, concludes that 17:11-19 originated in the Hellenistic Church and was dependent upon the Mk. 1:40-45 story. Cf. further, Fuller, Miracles, p. 66; Richardson, p. 112; Gilmour, I.B., vol. 8, p. 297, who all assume some connexion between 17:11-19 and Mk. 1:40-45.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Conzelmann, pp. 71f. According to him, this viewpoint is reflected in the fact that the Samaritan is considered inferior in this story.

elsewhere (5:25f.; 7:16; 13:13; 18:43), Luke has noted that the man "praises God" (δοξάζων τὸν θεόν) because of his miraculous healing,<sup>1</sup> the real point of the story lies in the fact that it is a Samaritan who returns to give thanks to Jesus (v.16). This theme of gratitude is also accented in the questions of Jesus, "Were not ten cleansed? Where are the nine? Was no one found to return and give praise to God except this foreigner?" (v.17f.).

As in 10:29-37, Luke has contrasted the action of the Samaritan with that of those who in the light of the phrase εἰ μὴ ὁ ἀλλογενὴς οὗτος are presumably Jews, and by means of this story he has provided another basis for the Church's missionary work among non-Jewish peoples.<sup>2</sup> There is no doubt that Luke knew about the early Christians' activity among the Samaritans as

---

<sup>1</sup>It is interesting to observe that one of Luke's favourite words, ἵσθαι (found eleven times in Luke while only once in Mark), appears in v.15 (ἰδὼν ὅτι ἰάθη) rather than καθαρίζειν.

<sup>2</sup>Loisy, Évangiles Synoptiques, vol. 2, p. 182, states, "Il est infiniment probable, en effet, que Luc et peut-être même déjà l'auteur du document où l'évangéliste a pris cette histoire, voyaient dans le samaritain reconnaissant la figure des Gentils dociles à la prédication apostolique, et dans les neuf juifs ingrats la figure du judaïsme oublieux des miracles accomplis par le Sauveur, et indocile à sa parole."



Acts 8:4ff. firmly establishes.

Further, Fuller<sup>1</sup> has suggested that the story of the healing of Naaman, the Syrian, (II Ki. 5:1ff.) might have been influential in the formation of 17:11-19. Although it is impossible to establish this, there is the strong possibility that the third evangelist himself would have associated these two stories since in 4:27 he has already drawn attention to the Naaman story as an example of God's mission to the Gentiles. In any case it seems certain that it is significant for Luke that a non-Jew plays a more prominent part in the story than the other nine.

As in the case of Naaman (cf. II Ki. 5:10-14), the ten lepers are healed after they fulfilled the command which was given. They all went on their way to the priest.<sup>2</sup> By means of the closing words ἀναστὰς πορεύου ἡ πίστις σου σέσωξέν σε (v.19), however, the third evangelist has possibly wanted to draw attention to the profound differences between the healing of the nine lepers and that of the Samaritan. It is at least

---

<sup>1</sup>Miracles, p. 66.

<sup>2</sup>Were they to find the priests in Jerusalem? If Jerusalem was thus intended, this might suggest that this story was circulated in a Jerusalem tradition.

possible that the words ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε have been added by Luke himself since he has employed these same words in 7:50, 8:48 and 18:42.<sup>1</sup> Although in both 8:48 and 18:42 (cf. Mk. 5:34 and 10:52) this saying follows a healing miracle of Jesus, this is not the case in 7:50. In 7:48 the forgiveness of sins is the main issue. All this suggests that Luke's use of πίστις and σώζειν in 17:19 implies spiritual as well as physical restoration. The nine lepers receive physical healing, but the Samaritan receives more since he recognizes God's activity in the healing effected by Jesus.

As we have seen, the healing miracle is essential to this story since it provides the situation out of which the theme of the Samaritan's thankfulness arises. Nonetheless, 17:11-19 cannot be classified as a typical miracle story since it is essentially a story about thankfulness.<sup>2</sup> Undoubtedly, it has been preserved by Luke as a demonstration of faith, in particular, the faith of a non-Jew. This story demonstrates that God's mercy was extended to a Samaritan during the ministry of Jesus.

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Bultmann, History, p. 33, and Grundmann, Lukas, p. 334.

<sup>2</sup>Bultmann, History, p. 33, includes it among the "biographical apophthegms" while Dibelius, pp. 120f., describes it as a "legend."

The Healing of the Blind Beggar  
near Jericho--Lk. 18:35-43  
(Mk. 10:46-52; Mt. 20:29-34)

In Mark the story of the healing of Bartimaeus comes directly after the pericope which recounts the unusual request of the sons of Zebedee for the places of honour, but in Luke this incident has been omitted so that 18:35-43 follows the third prediction of Jesus' Passion (18:31-34). Moreover, Luke has reported that the healing of the blind man takes place while Jesus is entering Jericho (v.35) and not, as in Mk. 10:46, as he is leaving the city. Luke has probably made this change in the setting to prepare for the story of Zacchaeus (19:1-10), which also takes place in Jericho and which the third evangelist has inserted after the healing of the blind beggar.<sup>1</sup>

Apart from this alteration in the setting, Luke has made few changes which disclose his own peculiar understanding of the story.<sup>2</sup> At many points Luke has introduced his own vocabulary, but most often this has not varied the meaning of the story. For example, he has

---

<sup>1</sup>Thus Schmidt, pp. 264f. Cf. also Creed, p. 228; Grundmann, Lukas, p. 357; Gilmour, I.B., vol. 8, p. 318.

<sup>2</sup>It should be noted in passing that Luke has not mentioned the name of the blind man but has designated him by the words τυφλός τις (v.35).

employed ἑπαιτῶν (v.35) instead of προσαίτης (Mk. 10:46); ἐβόησεν (v.38) for κράζειν (Mk. 10:47); σιγήσῃ (v.39) for σιωπήσῃ (Mk. 10:48); and παραχρῆμα (v.43) for εὐθύς (Mk. 10:52).

In addition, however, Luke has substituted κύριε (v.41) for ῥαββουνί (Mk. 10:51) and ἀνάβλεψον (v.42) for ὕπαγε (Mk. 10:52), both of which provide us with a clue to Luke's use of this pericope. The third evangelist has possibly preferred to use the title κύριος since his Gentile readers would be less familiar with ῥαββουνί. In doing this, he has agreed with Matthew (Mt. 20:33). According to Luke, throughout his ministry Jesus is addressed as "Lord" by his disciples, and this suggests that for Luke this blind man also clearly exhibits his faith.<sup>1</sup>

The theme of faith which is central to the Markan story is taken over by Luke. Like Mark he has pictured the blind man begging alongside of the road. By adding a few words, Luke has explained that the blind man hears the crowd coming along and inquires about the commotion

---

<sup>1</sup>Elsewhere Luke has used κύριος in words of address to Jesus (cf. 5:12; 7:6; 13:23; 19:8). Further, Jesus is addressed as "Lord" by the disciples as a group (17:37; 22:38,49); by the "seventy" (10:17); by James and John (9:54); by Peter (5:8; 12:41; 22:33); by Martha (10:40); by an unnamed disciple (11:1) and by a would-be disciple (9:61).

(v.36). Some in the crowd reply that Jesus, the Nazarene,<sup>1</sup> is approaching (v.37a). As a result, the blind man cries out, "Jesus, Son of David, have mercy upon me!"<sup>2</sup> When the people in front of him<sup>3</sup> urge him to be silent, he cries out all the more, "Son of David, have mercy upon me!" It is then reported that Jesus stops and commands the blind man to be brought to him at which time his request for the restoration of his sight is granted. In v.41 the third evangelist has made certain changes since he has omitted the reference to the enthusiastic manner of the blind man (cf. Mk. 10:50). In addition, Luke has no longer noted that the people in the crowd inform the blind man that Jesus has called him (Mk. 10:49). Rather, in response to the command of Jesus the man is brought to him, and then Jesus asks him, "What do you want me to do for you?" (v.41a). Nonetheless, these changes do not really affect the

---

<sup>1</sup>Luke has ὁ Ναζωραῖος instead of ὁ Ναζαρηνός.

<sup>2</sup>It is obvious that the "Son of David" title plays a less significant role in the third Gospel than in Matthew. Cf. 19:38, in which Luke has omitted the reference to David (cf. Mk. 11:10 and Mt. 21:9), rewriting it "Blessed be the King (ὁ βασιλεύς) who comes in the name of the Lord!" Cf. Conzelmann, pp. 139, 172f., 198.

<sup>3</sup>In v.39 Luke has added οἱ προάγοντες, indicating more precisely who rebuke the blind man.



main theme of faith which is emphasized by the words ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε (v.42b).

Having observed all this, we must still consider the striking feature of the Lukan version. Although Luke has quite faithfully repeated the Markan account, retaining its theme of faith, he has revealed in the final two verses that he was far more interested than the second evangelist in the miracle itself. In Mark the story finishes on the note of faith and discipleship (cf. Mk. 10:52), and in the light of the second evangelist's special interest in the lack of understanding on the part of the disciples, the blind man's "following" is particularly significant.<sup>1</sup> By substituting ἀνάβλεψον (v.42) for ὕπαγε (Mk. 10:52), however, Luke has linked Jesus' words more closely with the miracle itself.<sup>2</sup> In addition, he has eliminated the words ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ (Mk. 10:52) and has indicated instead that after the blind man receives his sight he follows Jesus "glorifying God." Finally, he has added that " . . . all the people, when they saw it, gave praise to God"

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. above, pp. 113-120.

<sup>2</sup>Lagrange, Luc, p. 486, declares, " . . . en remplaçant ὕπαγε, naturel mais vague, par ἀνάβλεψον qui est le miracle demandé."

(v.43b--καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἰδὼν ἔδωκεν αἶνον<sup>1</sup> τῷ θεῷ). Without a doubt, Luke has intended to mean that the people praise God because they see (ἰδὼν) the miracle involving the restoration of sight. As in other instances it is Jesus' miracle which prompts the witnesses to render praise to God (cf. 5:25f.; 7:16; 9:43; 13:13; 17:15).

We have observed that Luke has considerably altered the vocabulary of the Markan account but has essentially left unchanged the general features of the story. Although he has included the theme of faith, he has not connected the pericope so intimately with the Passion. This is clear since Luke has recounted the story of Zacchaeus (19:1-10), not Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, directly after it and in a somewhat characteristic manner has drawn attention to the miracle itself. The healing of the blind beggar is a deed of Jesus which for Luke reveals the action of God among his people.

#### Summary: Luke's Use of the Miracle Stories

Like Matthew, Luke has utilized most of the Markan miracle stories while at the same time supplementing

---

<sup>1</sup>The word αἶνος occurs only here and in Mt. 21:16 in the New Testament.

them with other pericopae which report miracles of Jesus and for which there exist no parallel accounts in any other Gospel (5:1-11; 7:11-17; 13:10-17; 14:1-6; 17:11-19). We have observed, however, that the miracles of Jesus themselves were more important to Luke than to the first evangelist. While Matthew has delayed reporting the deeds of Jesus until the authoritativeness of his teaching has been established (cf. Mt. 7:28f.),<sup>1</sup> the third evangelist has laid particular stress upon Jesus' deeds from the beginning of his Gospel. The fact that the teaching of the Sermon on the Plain comes much later in the third Gospel (6:20ff.) than in Matthew discloses this Lukan emphasis.

As we have seen, Luke has introduced Jesus' ministry by means of the Nazareth story which, containing no real teaching of Jesus, points primarily to his deeds (cf. esp. 4:18 and 4:23-27). This pericope is followed by the exorcism narrative in which Luke has concentrated upon Jesus' power over the demons and not upon the authority of his teaching (cf. 4:31-37 with

---

<sup>1</sup>It is true that Matthew has included the account of Jesus' call of the disciples (4:18-22) and a summary section mentioning the preaching and healing by Jesus (4:23-25) prior to chapter 5, but, nonetheless, Matthew's principal plan becomes recognizable in the juxtaposition of chapters 5-7 and chapters 8-9.

Mk. 1:21-28). Having postponed the account of Jesus' call of the disciples, Luke has further demonstrated the key role that miracles play in his Gospel. Peter and the disciples respond to Jesus' call not solely on the basis of his word, as is the case in Mark (cf. Mk. 1:16-20), but after they have seen the manifestation of his miraculous power on the lake (5:1-11). In addition, in 5:15 (cf. Mk. 1:45) the third evangelist has drawn attention to the fact that the dissemination of the report about Jesus results in more healings, and in 6:17-19 he has prepared for the Sermon on the Plain by recounting additional healings which issue from Jesus' power.<sup>1</sup> Finally, in 9:11, prior to the feeding of the 5000, Luke has pictured Jesus in his Messianic function of preaching about the Kingdom of God and healing the sick (cf. Mk. 6:34). The fact that Jesus' deeds of healing verify his Messiahship is confirmed by the manner in which Luke has ordered chapter 7; he has not

---

<sup>1</sup>It should be noted that by referring first to the naming of Jesus' disciples (6:12-16) and then to the healings of Jesus (6:17-19) Luke has reversed the Markan sequence (cf. Mk. 3:7-19). Cf. Conzelmann, p. 45, who suggests that the third evangelist has consciously set the stage for the Sermon by placing the demonstration of Jesus' miraculous power directly prior to it. At the same time these healings provide the pattern for the work of the disciples.

only prepared for Jesus' answer to the question of John the Baptist (7:22) by including the healing of the centurion's servant in 7:1-10 and the raising of the widow's son in 7:11-17 but also has reported in 7:21, "In that hour he [Jesus] cured many of diseases and plagues and evil spirits, and on many that were blind he bestowed sight."

Conzelmann<sup>1</sup> considers the implications of the phrase ἃ εἶδετε καὶ ἤκούσατε in 7:22 for the Lukan plan. Although he rightly decides that it is risky to deduce too much from the fact that "seeing" comes before "hearing,"<sup>2</sup> he suggests that for the third evangelist the act of seeing takes precedence over that of hearing.<sup>3</sup> Conzelmann goes on to declare:

---

<sup>1</sup>Pp. 190-193.

<sup>2</sup>It is interesting to note that Mt. 11:4 has the reversed order-- ἃ ἀκούετε καὶ βλέπετε.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Conzelmann, p. 192, fn. 2. For support he refers to Acts 2:33, 4:20, 22:14f., all of which indicate that seeing precedes hearing, and Acts 13:12, in which seeing and believing are closely associated. Cf. also 10:23, in which Luke has μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ οἱ βλέποντες ἃ βλέπετε while Matthew in 13:16 has ὑμῶν δὲ μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὅτι βλέπουσιν, καὶ τὰ ὦτα [ὑμῶν] ὅτι ἀκούουσιν; and 19:37, in which on the occasion of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem " . . . the whole multitude of the disciples began to rejoice and praise God with a loud voice for all the mighty works that they had seen" (περὶ πασῶν ὧν εἶδον δυνάμεων).



In this connection we must bear in mind Luke's idea of the Kingdom of God and the relation of Jesus' ministry to it: in Jesus' deeds we see an image of salvation. In his teaching the Kingdom is proclaimed, in other words, the nature of what he does is interpreted. This again means that what he does comes first. The sayings about "seeing the Kingdom" are a proof of this.<sup>1</sup>

Thus according to Luke, Jesus is the Messiah who is affirmed by God through works of power and through whose activity the time of salvation has first drawn near to men. Occasionally a passage in the book of Acts is particularly worth noting since in summary fashion the view of the third evangelist was apparently expressed. One such passage is Acts 2:22, in which Jesus is described in Peter's sermon as " . . . a man attested to you by God with mighty works (δυνάμεις) and wonders (τέρατα) and signs (σημεία) which God did through him in your midst . . . " Given this Lukan emphasis, it is understandable why for him a true witness is one who not only witnessed the Resurrection but also accompanied Jesus from the time of his Baptism until his Ascension (cf. Acts 1:21f.). In other words, to be a witness one had to see the deeds of Jesus from the outset of his

---

<sup>1</sup>P. 192.

ministry.<sup>1</sup>

It is not surprising to observe that the results of our detailed investigation of the Lukan miracle stories substantiate the conclusion that the third evangelist has shown definite interest in the deeds of Jesus as events which in themselves are of undeniable significance. In our study of the Matthean miracle stories, we have seen how frequently the redaction of the first evangelist has tended to de-emphasize the miracle itself, bringing out the didactic value of the narrative. Luke, on the other hand, has quite consistently neglected the various themes contained in the Markan stories and has deliberately highlighted the miracles themselves.

Occasionally, it would seem that Luke has inserted small details into the narrative either to heighten the tragedy of the scene or to improve its drama. In 4:38 Simon's mother-in-law is ill "with a high fever," and in 5:12 the leper is described as a man "full of leprosy." In three instances (7:12; 8:42; 9:38) Luke has

---

<sup>1</sup>Conzelmann, pp. 37f., makes the interesting suggestion that this explains why the people in Nazareth, including Jesus' relatives, could never have been real witnesses. As 4:16-30 asserts, the miracles of Jesus are accomplished elsewhere, not in Nazareth.

indicated that it is the "only" child who requires Jesus' healing, and elsewhere (4:39; 5:25; 8:44,47; 8:55; 13:13; 18:43) he has drawn attention to the suddenness of the cure.<sup>1</sup>

Far more important than these rather minor adjustments of the stories is the consistent way in which the third evangelist has focused his reader's attention on the miracle itself. He has frequently accomplished this by attaching a reference to praise rendered by the patient and/or the witnesses (5:25f.; 7:16; 13:13; 17:15; 18:43). As 5:26, 7:16, 8:25 and 8:35,37 also reveal, the miracles of Jesus sometimes cause fear in those who see them.<sup>2</sup>

We have already noted that in 4:31-37 Luke has emphasized Jesus' exorcism and not the authority of his teaching. In addition, we need to note that in both the healing of the epileptic boy (9:37-43a) and the healing of the blind beggar (18:35-43) the third evangelist has obviously passed over the theme of discipleship in favour of emphasizing the miraculous deed of Jesus itself (cf. 9:43a and 18:43). As a result, like

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. above, pp. 290,308.

<sup>2</sup>In this connexion, the confession of Simon Peter in 5:8 should be noted.

7:11-17, 9:37-43a approximates more closely the pattern of the typical miracle story. Further, unlike Mark, Luke has not intimately linked either 8:22-25 or 9:10-17 with the theme of the disciples' lack of understanding. This has meant that the Christological significance of these incidents is emphasized more exclusively. Further, even 13:10-13, which introduces the sabbath controversy theme (13:14-16), retains the principal features of a miracle story. In fact, v.17 demonstrates that Luke was interested in the miracle as well as the sabbath controversy, and it is worth noting that again in this instance the Lukan emphasis is upon "seeing" as the basis for "hearing." In 14:1-6 and 6:6-11 (Mk. 3:1-6), however, Luke has included stories in which the dominant theme involves the meaning of the sabbath. As in 5:17-26, the third evangelist has heightened the drama of the incident in 6:6-11 by introducing Jesus' enemies at the outset of the story. Finally, it should be noted that, unlike Mk. 14:47f. and Mt. 26:51-53, 22:51 reports that Jesus heals the ear of the slave of the high priest although it need not be concluded that Luke has inserted this detail simply because of his interest

in the miracles of Jesus.<sup>1</sup>

It is true that Luke has retained the theme of faith in the story of Jairus' daughter and that of the woman with the flow of blood (8:40-56) as well as in the story of the blind beggar (18:42). As we have seen, he has deliberately linked the concepts of "faith" and "salvation." Nevertheless, it is also certain that he was interested in the miracles themselves since these interlocking stories portray the effect of Jesus' power to heal (8:46; cf. 6:19) and to raise the dead (8:55f.). Possibly Luke has also wished to introduce the theme of faith and discipleship in 8:35 by means of the words *κατὰ τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ*, and without a doubt the story of the ten lepers presents faith and thankfulness as the major themes (17:16,19). 17:11-19 is probably also employed by Luke because it is a Samaritan who is pictured (cf. Acts 8:4ff.). Finally, as we have seen,<sup>2</sup> Jesus is frequently addressed as "Lord."

By means of the story of the centurion (7:1-10),

---

<sup>1</sup>p. S. Minear, "A Note on Luke xxii 36," *N.T.*, 7 (March, 1964), pp. 131f., concludes, "His healing of the ear is both a tacit rebuke for their [his followers] use of the sword and proof that he was not at the mercy of their actions."

<sup>2</sup>Cf. above, p. 374, fn. 1.



Luke has introduced a Gentile into the ministry of Jesus, but it is perhaps significant that, unlike Matthew, he has deliberately portrayed him as a "God-fearing" Gentile who avoids contact with Jesus. Since Luke has omitted the Markan story of the Syrophenician woman (Mk. 7:24-30), in his Gospel Jesus only comes into direct contact with Gentiles during the Galilean phase of his ministry in 8:26-39.

All this leads us to conclude that to a far less extent than Matthew Luke has modified the miracle stories which he had at his disposal to provide guidance for the Church of his day in the questions concerning, for example, faith, discipleship, and the place of the Gentiles in the Church. It would rather appear that he has repeated quite faithfully the substance of the stories which were available to him, stressing whenever possible the revelatory nature of Jesus' deeds.

If Conzelmann's analysis of the Lukan plan of history is correct,<sup>1</sup> then there is reason to believe that

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Conzelmann, pp. 12-17, where he sets forth his analysis of the plan for the whole of Luke's writings (the Gospel and the book of Acts) and the scheme for the ministry of Jesus itself. For a critical examination of Conzelmann's conclusions, see W. C. Robinson, Jr., Der Weg des Herrn: Studien zur Geschichte und Eschatologie im Lukas-Evangelium, trans. Gisela and Georg Strecker (Theologische Forschung: Wissenschaftliche Beiträge

more than the other evangelists Luke has sought to picture the miracles of Jesus as events of the past. Luke is the one evangelist who has come closest to writing "a life of Jesus." In his summary Fuller, perhaps drawing upon the work of Conzelmann, quite succinctly draws attention to the importance of Jesus' miracles in the plan of the third Gospel:

To conclude, Luke is more interested than the other evangelists in the miracles as facts of past history. They are part, and indeed the most important part, of Jesus' biography prior to his passion. Yet Luke is not uninterested in their meaning. They are characteristic of the central phase of the mighty acts of man's redemption. The Old Testament had prophesied them; they occur in Jesus; and the later church, from its own standpoint, looks back upon them, and draws lessons for the understanding of its own mission.<sup>1</sup>

In the book of Acts Luke has indicated that the apostles and other members of the early Church are also empowered to heal and to work wonders (cf. Acts 2:43; 5:12; 15f.; 6:8; 8:6f., 13; 14:3; 14:8ff.; 15:12; 19:11f.). It is sometimes stated that these miracles were accomplished in the name of Jesus (cf. Acts 3:6, 16; 4:7-12, 30; 16:16-18), or, in other words, as Acts 9:34 makes

---

zur kirchlich-evangelischen Lehre, No. 36"; Hamburg-Bergstedt, 1964), esp. pp. 7-43.

<sup>1</sup>Miracles, p. 87. The whole of Fuller's summary of "The Meaning of Miracles to Luke" (pp. 82-87) is quite solid and worthwhile.

clear, the apostles had become instrumental in carrying out the healing ministry of the exalted Lord.<sup>1</sup> The early Christians' ability to work miracles is to be linked to the presence of the Spirit among them (cf. Acts 2:1ff. and 4:8) which, according to Luke, is promised to them by the risen Christ (cf. 24:49 and Acts 1:8). Thus it is through the Spirit that the earthly ministry of Jesus is connected with the ministry which continues in the Church.

As Conzelmann<sup>2</sup> has pointed out, however, there exists a qualitative difference between Jesus' endowment of the Spirit and its presence in the early Church. During Jesus' earthly life, he alone is invested with the Spirit, having been uniquely anointed (cf. 4:18; Acts 10:38; Acts 4:27). Before Easter and Pentecost his disciples (cf. 9:1f., 6) and those whom he commissions (cf. 10:9, 17-20) are able to heal the sick and to exercise control over demons only because Jesus chooses to share with them something of the authority and power which are uniquely his and which are closely

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Conzelmann, pp. 177f.

<sup>2</sup>Pp. 103, 180. For another consideration of the Lukan concept of the Spirit, see G. W. H. Lampe, "The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke," Studies in the Gospels, ed. D. E. Nineham, pp. 159-200.

linked with his reception of the Spirit.

As we have observed, Luke far more than either Mark or Matthew has portrayed Jesus as one who acts in the power of the Spirit (see 3:22; 4:1; 4:14; 4:18). In 4:14 the third evangelist has specifically coupled the words πνεῦμα and δύναμις, apparently using them interchangeably. This suggests that for Luke Jesus' power to effect miracles is to be understood as a direct consequence of his endowment with the Spirit (cf. also 5:17).<sup>1</sup> As we have seen,<sup>2</sup> Luke's significant departure from the manner in which Mark has employed δύναμις involves his linking this word with the Spirit. By doing so Luke has eliminated the eschatological meaning which δύναμις possesses in Mark.

Having thus concluded that Luke has deliberately linked Jesus' power to work miracles with his possession of the Spirit and that he has infrequently introduced the situation of the contemporary Church into his reports of Jesus' miracles, we must now note the way in which he has developed the ministry of Jesus. Primarily on the weight of two passages (4:13 and 22:3),

---

<sup>1</sup>Further, it should be noted that in 4:36 δύναμις and ἐξουσία appear to be synonymous.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. above, pp. 282f.

Conzelmann<sup>1</sup> argues that the third evangelist has portrayed the ministry of Jesus as a time free from Satan. Satan departs from Jesus after the Temptation (ἄρτι καιροῦ) and does not return until he enters into Judas (Ἐίστηλθεν δὲ σατανᾶς εἰς Ἰούδαν). According to Conzelmann,<sup>2</sup> the time of the Passion and the time of the Church are the times of temptation (cf. 22:28,31,40). This theme is brought out particularly in 22:53, in which Jesus says to his arresters, "But this is your hour, and the power of darkness." Undoubtedly, Luke has intensified his interest in the presence of Satan and evil during the Passion of Jesus, but it seems somewhat less than certain that he has consistently pictured Jesus' ministry as a time completely free from temptation.

In 4:6 Luke has asserted that authority over worldly things has been temporarily given over to Satan, but during Jesus' ministry even his disciples have authority over the power of the enemy (cf. 10:17-19). 10:17-19 as well as 13:11,16 demonstrates that the demons are to be associated with Satan. Jesus' exorcisms exhibit the power of the Spirit over them (4:31-37; 8:26-39; 9:37-43a; cf. also 4:38f.). Like

---

<sup>1</sup>Pp. 27-29.

<sup>2</sup>Pp. 80-83.



Matthew, Luke has introduced the Beelzebub controversy by means of a report of an exorcism (11:14ff.).<sup>1</sup> In 4:41 the demons recognize Jesus as the Son of God,<sup>2</sup> and in 8:31 they are consigned to the place of torment. Acts 10:38, in particular, is significant since it describes Jesus as one who " . . . went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed by the devil, for God was with him."

It would appear that Luke's plan for Jesus' ministry is summarized in 13:32, where in reply to the threat of Herod Jesus declares, "Go and tell that fox, 'Behold, I cast out demons and perform cures today and tomorrow, and the third day I finish my course.'" According to Conzelmann,<sup>3</sup> for Luke Jesus' ministry consists of three stages: the Galilean period (4:14-9:50); the long journey to Jerusalem (9:51-19:27); and the Passion in Jerusalem (19:28ff.). What is noteworthy for us is

---

<sup>1</sup>For a discussion of 11:14f. and Mt. 12:22-24, see above, pp. 207ff. and pp. 196-198.

<sup>2</sup>The "Messianic secret" in Mark, in which the evil spirits alone recognize Jesus' Sonship and the disciples remain ignorant, has not been systematically reproduced by Luke. The omissions of Mk. 6:45-8:27 and Mk. 9:9-14 (esp. 9:9) particularly disrupt this Markan scheme.

<sup>3</sup>E.g., p. 197. Cf., however, W. C. Robinson, Jr., op. cit., esp. pp. 23f.

the fact that Jesus performs miracles only for "two days" and not during his Jerusalem ministry (although it should be noted that in 19:37 the multitude of disciples in Jerusalem praises God for his mighty acts). Perhaps this fact explains why the story of the cursing of the fig tree has been omitted by Luke (cf. Mk. 11:12-14,20-25). Conzelmann calls attention to this feature when he states,

In Mark also there are no miracles performed in public [during the Passion narrative], but the reason for it is different. For Mark, miracles are simply out of the question in Jerusalem, as this city is a place of evil . . . Luke's reason, on the other hand, is a psychological one, arising from his conception of miracles, according to which a miracle of itself has convincing power [to all who witness them?].<sup>1</sup>

Finally, we must briefly consider Luke's omission of the longer Markan section (Mk. 6:45-8:27a) which includes the second Sea of Galilee miracle, the healing of the daughter of the Syrophoenician woman, the healing of the deaf mute, the second feeding narrative and the healing of the blind man. Unless Streeter is correct in supposing that Luke's copy of Mark lacked this

---

<sup>1</sup>Pp. 76f. It should be remembered that Luke has reported in 22:51 the healing of the servant's ear but, as we have already noted (cf. above, pp. 384f.), his primary purpose was not to make a public display of Jesus' ability to work miracles.

section,<sup>1</sup> we need to find another explanation. We agree with Conzelmann in finding more cogency in the argument of Taylor<sup>2</sup> than in that of Streeter since Taylor concludes that the framework of this Markan section--the fact that it contains duplication of earlier material and reports a trip into Phoenicia and the Decapolis--caused the third evangelist to exclude it. We have already noted that, in addition, Luke no longer situates Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi. This would also seem to support the conclusion that by means of this great omission Luke has been able to present a more consistent Galilean ministry of Jesus. In Luke Jesus is one who ministers essentially to his own people.

We can thus briefly state that for Luke the miracles of Jesus possessed definite evidential value. They were obviously the works of God among men and attested that Jesus was endowed with the Spirit. For this reason, the Lukan emphasis is more in line with the Old Testament conception of the Spirit-filled prophet than with the Hellenistic idea of the θεῖος ἀνὴρ. Jesus' miraculous

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. above, pp. 344f. See, however, Haenchen, Der Weg, pp. 256, 304, who hesitates to reject the "defective Markan manuscript" theory too quickly.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. V. Taylor, Behind the Third Gospel (Oxford, 1926), esp. p. 91.

deeds direct the attention of the witnesses to God and cause them to give him praise. Luke has not been particularly inclined to import the situation of the contemporary Church into the stories about Jesus but has presented them more as events of the past which serve as the ideal pattern for those in the Church. Although he has not usually eliminated special themes when they were part of the Markan stories, e.g., the theme of faith, he has not normally highlighted them. Unlike Mark, however, Luke has not portrayed the disciples in such an unfavourable light, i.e., as totally misunderstanding the significance of Jesus' miracles, although in the third Gospel there is evidence that they do not fully comprehend the meaning of Jesus' Passion (cf. 9:43b-45). In fact, for Luke it is the convincing nature of Jesus' miraculous deeds which forms the basis for Peter's (and the other disciples') entry into the relationship of discipleship. As Acts 1:21f. indicates, to be an apostle one had to have seen Jesus' ministry of deed and word as well as be a witness to his Resurrection. Throughout his Gospel, Luke has shown that Jesus' deeds are central to his ministry and prove that his mission, culminating in his death and Resurrection, is the fulfilment of the law and the prophets (cf. 24:28-53; see also 13:33-35, 18:31-33).

## CHAPTER IV

### THE SIGNS IN JOHN

Having considered the importance of the miracle stories in each of the Synoptic Gospels, we now turn to the fourth Gospel for an examination of the Johannine signs. Throughout this chapter we designate the author of this Gospel as either John or the fourth evangelist. We accept the conclusion of many scholars<sup>1</sup> that chapter 21 and perhaps other sections have been added by a later redactor and will occasionally note the opinions regarding specific passages. In addition, we accept the findings of certain commentators that John has not directly employed one or more of the Synoptic Gospels but has had at his disposal a tradition largely independent from

---

<sup>1</sup>Thus, e.g., Bultmann, Brown and Barrett although they differ greatly in the amount of the present Gospel which they assign to the later redactor. Cf. W. F. Howard, The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation, rev. by C. K. Barrett (4th ed. rev.; London, 1955), pp. 95-110, for a discussion about the unity of the Gospel. Cf. also Appendix C (pp. 297-302).



that of the other three Gospels.<sup>1</sup> Although we admit the possibility that the Gospel of John could have gone through various revisions, perhaps by the original author himself, prior to its coming into the hands of its final redactor,<sup>2</sup> it seems extremely hazardous to attempt a systematic determination of the different layers of composition. We plan to proceed in our consideration of "the signs" and "the works" of Jesus as they are set forth in the Gospel as we now have it, differentiating between the pre-Johannine tradition and the fourth evangelist's contribution only wherever it seems appropriate. Since in John--even more so than in the Synoptic Gospels--we are confronted with a theological unity, we intend to advance in our study chapter by chapter, commenting on each section or pericope which seems to be pertinent to an understanding of the miraculous in the fourth Gospel.

1:14--This verse sets forth in a concise manner the Johannine interpretation of the meaning of Jesus' life among men. He is the true revelation of the Father; in

---

<sup>1</sup>Thus, e.g., Bultmann, Brown and Dodd. Barrett, among others, thinks that John knew and used Mark.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Brown, pp. XXXII-XXXIX, for a discussion of the various theories proposed, including the one which he adopts.

his words and deeds men see the glory of God. In the Johannine presentation of his ministry Jesus acts as the Son of God with divine knowledge and power.

1:42--Here we are presented with the first example of Jesus' divine knowledge. Although Jesus has never previously seen Simon, he straightway identifies him and, discerning his character, names him Peter.

1:47-51--The same motif occurs in this section. Prior to his meeting Nathanael Jesus perceives the true nature of this Israelite, and it is because of this display of supernatural knowledge that Nathanael makes his confession of faith, acknowledging Jesus to be the Son of God, the King of Israel. The promise that Nathanael will see far greater things (v.50) presumably prepares for the more obvious manifestations of Jesus' divine glory which are to follow. By selecting the plural form (ὅμῃν) in v.51<sup>1</sup> John has perhaps intentionally worded this promise of future revelation so that it would be applicable to the whole circle of disciples (and perhaps readers). Though the disciples believe in Jesus because of what he said, they must also see his works which

---

<sup>1</sup>Bultmann, Johannes, p. 68, judges v.51 to be a Johannine addition intended to widen the meaning of v.50. 5:20b should be compared. See also Brown, pp. 90f.

manifest his glory.

The Miracle of the Wine at the Wedding at  
Cana--2:1-11

V.11<sup>1</sup> is the key to the Johannine interpretation of the story of the Cana wedding. This incident provided for John the first dramatic demonstration of Jesus' glory and the only reaction which he has stressed is the belief of the disciples. The fact that they perceive the Cana miracle as a sign was John's means of confirming what has already been stated in the prologue--Jesus is the One sent from God as a divine revelation to men. This reference to the disciples' belief follows the recounting in 1:29-51 of the reactions of the five disciples to Jesus and was perhaps meant by John to show that their initial responses do not constitute genuine faith. Undoubtedly, the miracle itself was intended as the commencement of the "greater things" promised to Nathanael (and to all the disciples). If, as it seems likely, the fourth evangelist has designed the time notice in 2:1 (καὶ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

---

<sup>1</sup>Although v.11a was probably included in John's material, the remainder of the verse (καὶ ἐφανερώσεν . . . οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ) has certainly resulted from John's redaction. Cf. Bultmann, Johannes, p. 79, and Lightfoot, John, p. 101. The verbs φανεροῦν and πιστεύειν reappear frequently in the course of the fourth Gospel.

τῇ τρίτῃ) as the last of a series which was begun in the preceding chapter (cf. 1:29,35,43), there is further reason for supposing that he has deliberately linked 2:1-11 with that which goes before it.<sup>1</sup>

When Jesus' mother calls his attention to the depletion of the wine supply during the course of the wedding feast, he responds with the following words: Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, γύναι; οὐκ ἔχει ἡ ὥρα μου. Although a great deal of attention has been given to the meaning of the first five words in Jesus' response,<sup>2</sup> they primarily

---

<sup>1</sup>Barrett, John, p. 158, and Lightfoot, John, pp. 93f., suggest that the Johannine presentation of Jesus' public ministry does not actually begin until after 2:1-11. In addition, although the reference to the third day in 2:1 has presented considerable difficulty in reckoning the Johannine chronology (cf., e.g., Loisy, Quatrième Évangile, p. 138f.), it is debatable that in these words John has intended a veiled allusion to Jesus' Resurrection. It should be noted that John has not included a reference to "the third day" in his account of the Resurrection (cf. 20:1). Dodd, Interpretation, pp. 299f., and Lightfoot, John, p. 105, see a reference to the Resurrection in 2:1. Cf. Brown, pp. 105f., for a consideration of the seven day schemes which have been worked out on the basis of 1:19-2:11. These schemes are largely unconvincing. In any case, the time note does imply that 2:1-11 should be firmly attached to 1:19-51.

<sup>2</sup>Most Roman Catholic exegetes have been concerned to show that these words were not intended in a derogatory fashion. [For a listing of some Roman Catholic studies on 2:1-11, cf. A. Feuillet, Études Johanniques (Paris, 1962), p. 11.]. The words τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί (cf. Mk. 1:24 and Mk. 5:7) are a Greek rendering of a Jewish expression which, according to Strack-Billerbeck (vol.

serve as an introduction to the second half of v.4, which was undoubtedly far more important to John. In the light of his use of ὥρα in certain passages (7:30; 8:20; 12:23,27; 13:1; 17:1; cf. also 7:8) it seems probable that the fourth evangelist has intended the words οὐκ ἔχει ἡ ὥρα μὲν to be an allusion to Jesus' death and glorification.<sup>1</sup> If this is so, then John has closely connected this Cana miracle with Jesus' death and Resurrection, or, as Leroy puts it, " . . . in Kana mit der Offenbarung der Herrlichkeit Jesu zugleich seine 'Stunde' beginnt."<sup>2</sup> Thus, when the whole of v.11 is seen in the light of the statement of Jesus in v.4, it becomes clear that for John the faith of the disciples was ultimately anchored in the "hour" of Jesus' final glorification--i.e., the cross and Resurrection.

The details of the story are recounted in such a

---

2, p. 401), does not mean that fellowship is being denied but rather that a question is being posed about the reason for the request (cf. I Ki. 17:18; II Ki. 3:13; II Chron. 35:21).

<sup>1</sup>H. Leroy, "Das Weinwunder zu Kana," Bibel und Leben, 4 (1963), pp. 169f., notes that Wikenhauser [Das Evangelium nach Johannes (Regensburg, 1957), p. 74] holds that ὥρα in v.4 refers to the moment appointed by the Father for the working of miracles. Leroy, however, concludes that it points to Jesus' Passion.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 170.



way that it becomes clear to the reader that the miracle of the wine is not recognized by all those present at the wedding celebration. It is emphasized that the steward does not know the source of the newly created wine although it is reported parenthetically that the servants who drew the water know where it came from (v.9).<sup>1</sup> That they know this fact does not necessarily imply that in the Johannine sense they comprehend the meaning of Jesus' action. In addition, it should be observed that Mary immediately instructs the servants to carry out the orders of Jesus even though his words in v.4 appear to be a censure of her implied request. She obviously does not understand the full import of Jesus' words, "My hour has not yet come." She expects a miracle from him; she does not evidently perceive that Jesus is not to be constrained by human wishes since he acts independently, according to a divine pre-ordained plan.<sup>2</sup> The deeper significance of the miracle of the wine is

---

<sup>1</sup>Bultmann, Johannes, p. 79, supposes that the words καὶ οὐκ ᾔδειν . . . τὸ ὕδωρ in v.9b comprise a Johannine insertion into the sign-source. In any case, it is plausible that the fourth evangelist has added them to whatever material he had before him since they are not absolutely essential to the meaning of the story.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Leroy, op. cit., p. 173.

only recognized by those who have the eyes of faith.

The fourth evangelist has appropriately employed 2:1-11 as a prelude to Jesus' public ministry and as a means of introducing the fundamental theme in John which is re-emphasized in the stories which follow (cf. 2:13-22; 3:1ff.; 4:4ff.)--Jesus embodies the gift of God to men and with his advent the new age of grace has superseded the old one under the law. In all probability the fourth evangelist would have seen in this story the contrast between the old and the new dispensations, i.e., between the water for the Jewish rite of purification and the new wine whose abundance and superiority are obvious (cf. v.6 and v.10).<sup>1</sup> For John, the miracle existed not in the fact of Jesus' provision of wine for the wedding party but in the fact that he provides wine which is better than that served before.

In view of the details of this story it is obvious why it has been interpreted sacramentally in connexion

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Brown, pp. CXLIII, 104, who draws attention to this motif in the fourth Gospel; he speaks of it as a "theme of replacement." Richardson, pp. 121f., particularly stresses that the Cana miracle signifies that Judaism is transformed and finds its fulfilment in the person of Jesus. Cf. also Lightfoot, John, p. 100.

with either baptism<sup>1</sup> or the Eucharist.<sup>2</sup> Although this story undoubtedly attracted such interpretations even in the early Church, it must be seen that the principal subject of this pericope is not directly sacramental.<sup>3</sup> The main theme centres around Jesus' self-disclosure in the miracle of the wine. The revelation of God's glory which will culminate in the death and Resurrection of Jesus has commenced in this miracle in Cana; this sign is apprehended by his disciples in faith.

2:18-22--John's presentation of the narrative about Jesus' cleansing of the temple builds upon the major motif in the story of the Cana miracle, i.e., Jesus is the divine manifestation of God and his coming means that the time of Judaism has ended. As a further

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf., e.g., P. Niewalda, Sakramentssymbolik im Johannesevangelium (Limburg, 1958), p. 166, as referred to by Brown, p. 110.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. esp. O. Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, trans. A. S. Todd and J. B. Torrance ("Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 10"; London, 1953), pp. 68-71.

<sup>3</sup>Bultmann (Johannes, p. 84), for whom the evangelist is an anti-sacramentalist, denies the validity of the interpretation which sees in the wine a symbol of the Eucharist and, in particular, of the blood of Jesus. Contrary to Bultmann, it seems likely that John would have been aware that the features of the story in 2:1-11 were open to a sacramental interpretation even though this was not the explicit theme. Brown, pp. 109f., rightly sees that the Eucharistic symbolism is incidental to the story and should not be over-emphasized.

explication of this theme John has made it clear in 2:18-22 that the Resurrection represents the ultimate sign of this truth. After Jesus has expelled the merchants and money-changers from the temple, the Jews demand of him a sign as an authorization of his right for doing these things (v.19). As Jesus' answer, the fourth evangelist has included a form of the saying which occurs in a different context in Mark (cf. Mk. 14:58 and 15:29): "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up."<sup>1</sup> The deeper implications of Jesus' answer are obviously not perceived by the Jews (v.20),<sup>2</sup> but in vv.21f. John has added an explanatory note for the benefit of his readers.<sup>3</sup> Jesus was actually speaking about "the temple of his body" (v.21). It was only after the Resurrection that the disciples understood this and believed in the scripture and in the word which Jesus had

---

<sup>1</sup> Ὑψίσαιν, which is used in the Johannine form of the saying, has the double meaning of "to raise"-- either a building or a person-- and therefore is more appropriate than οἰκοδομεῖν (Mk. 14:58) as an allusion to the Resurrection.

<sup>2</sup> John has frequently used the device of the failure of those who talk with Jesus to comprehend the deeper significance of his words to further the meaning of the narrative. Cf. 3:3f.; 4:10f.; 7:33-36; and 16:16ff.

<sup>3</sup> There can be little doubt that John was directly responsible for the inclusion of vv.21f. Cf. Bultmann, Johannes, p. 89, and Dodd, Interpretation, p. 301.

spoken (v.22).

Although the cleansing of the temple is not to be viewed as a miraculous act, it is important to note that for John it, like the Cana miracle, constituted a sign. According to him, the justification for Jesus' cleansing of the temple was anchored in the acknowledgement that Jesus' body was to become the true temple of God. Further, by connecting the disciples' recognition of this theological truth with the event of the Resurrection, John has reproduced more closely than in 2:11 the actual pattern of the historical events which unfolded in the early Church. Full understanding was possible only after the Resurrection and the coming of the Paraclete (cf. 14:26 and 16:14).

2:23-25--Following his account of the cleansing of the temple, which takes place in Jerusalem at the time of the Passover (cf. 2:13), the fourth evangelist has reported that Jesus does further signs which cause many other people at the feast to believe in his name (2:23--ἐπίστευσαν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, θεωροῦντες αὐτοῦ τὰ σημεῖα ἃ ἐποίει). John has here asserted that signs are capable of prompting the response of faith in those who witness them, but he has gone on to note that Jesus does not



trust (οὐκ ἐπίστευεν)<sup>1</sup> himself to them because of his knowledge of the true nature of man (vv.24f.). It is perhaps in this way that John has alluded to the questionable value of faith which is based only upon signs.<sup>2</sup> In any case, it is obvious that the fourth evangelist has composed these verses in preparation for 3:1ff., where Jesus converses with Nicodemus.<sup>3</sup>

3:2--The signs done by Jesus in Jerusalem have evidently also made an impression on Nicodemus, causing him to come to Jesus during the night. It is on account of the signs that this ruler of the Jews assumes that Jesus is a teacher who has come from God, but in the following conversation he is led into the deeper meaning of membership in the Kingdom of God.

4:16ff.--Here again we have an instance of Jesus' supernatural perception. He knows the past affairs of the woman of Samaria without her disclosure of them to him, and it is because of his special knowledge that she

---

<sup>1</sup>Perhaps, as MacGregor, p. 66, suggests, John has here employed πιστεύειν as a play on the word which appears just prior in v.23.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Brown, p. 127.

<sup>3</sup>Bultmann, Johannes, pp. 91f., and Dodd, Hist. Tradition, pp. 234f., judge 2:23-25 to betray the redactional work of the fourth evangelist.

supposes him to be a prophet (4:19).

4:43-45--After leaving Samaria Jesus enters Galilee again and is warmly welcomed by the Galileans, who, according to John, witnessed what Jesus had done in Jerusalem at the feast (cf. 2:23).<sup>1</sup> All this prepares for Jesus' return to Cana of Galilee, the place where he had accomplished the first sign, and the ensuing story of healing.

The Healing of the Official's Son--  
4:46-54

In this section John has included the report of the second sign which was done by Jesus in Cana of Galilee (4:54), and by means of his introductory words in 4:46a he has related it with the first sign (2:1-11). It is normally assumed that this story of the healing of the official's son is another version of the miracle

---

<sup>1</sup>Brown, p. 187, concludes that v.44--a notoriously difficult verse to interpret in its present context, often explained by assuming that in John Jesus' home country is considered to be Judea, not Galilee--was added by the redactor who, according to him, completed the final stage in the composition of the fourth Gospel (cf. pp. XXXVI-XXXVIII) in order to indicate the unsatisfactory faith of the Galileans (cf. 4:48). "In his estimation [the redactor's] the welcome given to Jesus in Galilee (vs.45) is just as shallow as the reaction that greeted Jesus in Jerusalem (ii 23-25)."

story recounted in Mt. 8:5-13/Lk. 7:1-10.<sup>1</sup> Although these two accounts probably go back to a common story in the early tradition, it is obvious that the Johannine story has enjoyed an extensive and independent development.<sup>2</sup> In their present forms there exist few verbal correspondences between 4:46-54 and Mt. 8:5-13/Lk. 7:1-10;<sup>3</sup> nevertheless, there is an agreement in the general outline of the stories. In every case, it is a prominent person (ἐκατόνταρχος in Mt. 8:5 and Lk. 7:2; βασιλικός in 4:46) who seeks help from Jesus for a sick member of his household (καὶς in Mt. 8:6; δοῦλος in

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. esp. Brown, pp. 192f. Thus also Bultmann, Johannes, p. 151; Barrett, John, p. 205; Bernard, vol. 1, pp. 165f.; Strathmann, p. 95; Howard, I.B., vol. 8, p. 536; and Fuller, Miracles, p. 37.

<sup>2</sup>Cf., however, Barrett, John, p. 205, who assumes " . . . that the synoptic tradition (or a tradition very closely akin to it) lies immediately behind the Johannine narrative . . . "

<sup>3</sup>The following three words appear in both the Lukan and Johannine stories: ἀκούσας (4:47 and Lk. 7:3), ἤμελλεν (4:47 and Lk. 7:2), and ἡρώτα/ἑρωτῶν (4:47 and Lk. 7:3). In addition, the phrase in 4:53 ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ resembles ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐκείνῃ in Mt. 8:13. Since Mt. 8:13 is undoubtedly due to Matthew's redaction, John would have had to know the Gospel of Matthew in order for the phrase in 4:53 to be dependent upon the Matthean story. All in all, it would appear that there is little evidence on the basis of verbal agreement for a direct relationship between 4:46-54 and the Synoptic accounts.

Lk. 7:2 and  $\kappa\alpha\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$  in Lk. 7:7;  $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$  in 4:46,  $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$  in 4:49 and  $\kappa\alpha\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$  in 4:51); in all three instances, the patient is in Capernaum and is healed from a distance.

It is now important to note how the fourth evangelist has used 4:46-54 in his Gospel, noting whenever appropriate the difference of its emphasis from that of the Synoptic account. It is immediately obvious that the theme of faith is central to both versions, but, nonetheless, there is a major difference. In Mt. 8:5-13/Lk. 7:1-10 it is the faith of the Gentile centurion which is commended by Jesus (cf. Mt. 8:10 and Lk. 7:9), but in the Johannine story it is not at all certain that the official is meant to be a Gentile.<sup>1</sup> It would seem that Schweizer<sup>2</sup> is right in claiming that John was not

---

<sup>1</sup>Most scholars [Bultmann, Johannes, pp. 151f.; Dodd, Hist. Tradition, p. 192; Westcott, vol. 1, p. 170; MacGregor, p. 123; Lagrange, Jean, p. 128; Richardson, p. 118; cf. esp. J. A. T. Robinson, "The Destination and Purpose of St. John's Gospel," N.T.S., 6 (1959-60), p. 120] presume that the designation  $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$  refers to a Jew and not a Gentile. Barrett, John, p. 206; Lightfoot, John, p. 128; and Strathmann, pp. 92f., assume that a Gentile is intended, but they do so on the basis of the parallel story of the centurion. In particular, Feuillet, op. cit., pp. 40f., contends that in 4:46-54 the fourth evangelist has pictured a Gentile whose faith stands in direct contrast to the disbelief of the Jerusalem authorities to be mentioned in 5:10ff.

<sup>2</sup>Thus E. Schweizer, "Die Heilung des Königlichen, Joh. 4:46-54," Evangelische Theologie, 11 (1951-52), pp. 64-71.

primarily concerned to highlight the faith of a Gentile and contrast it with the absence of faith among the Jews since by the time he composed his Gospel the Gentile question in the Church had been largely settled.

According to Schweizer,<sup>1</sup> the key to John's interpretation is to be found in v.48, in which Jesus declares to the official, "Unless you see signs and wonders (σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα)<sup>2</sup> you will not believe." It is sometimes suggested on the basis of the plural forms of the verbs (ἴδωτε, . . . πιστεύετε) that these words were intended by John as a general indictment against the Jewish people because they characteristically sought signs from Jesus to prove his claim of Messiahship. If, however, the fourth evangelist has inserted at this point a saying similar to those in the Synoptics (cf. Mk. 8:11f.; Mt. 16:1-4; Mt. 12:38f./Lk. 11:29f.),<sup>3</sup> this might account for the apparently abrupt and awkward position of v.48.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 68ff.

<sup>2</sup>This is the only time that the word τέρατα occurs in the fourth Gospel.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Dodd, Hist. Tradition, p. 192f., and MacGregor, p. 121.

<sup>4</sup>Dodd, Hist. Tradition, p. 192, concludes that Jesus' words in v.48 constitute an originally non-Johannine element. Bultmann, Johannes, p. 152, assumes that v.48 (and v.49) was inserted by the evangelist



Although John might have viewed this official as a representative of a group of people who required signs before they would believe (perhaps the Galileans mentioned in v.45), it must be remembered that Jesus' words are addressed to him after he has sought a miracle of healing for his son who is at the point of death (v.47). The official's response to Jesus' apparent rebuff was undoubtedly important for John's purposes. The father simply reiterates his request for his son (v.49),<sup>1</sup> and Jesus straightway announces, "Go; your son will live" (v.50). The official believes this promise of Jesus (v.50b-- ἐπίστευσεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῷ λόγῳ ὃν εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς) and departs for his home in Capernaum. After he meets his servants whose report confirms the exact hour of his son's miraculous healing (v.52), the official and his household believe (v.53-- καὶ ἐπίστευσεν αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ οἰκία αὐτοῦ ὅλη).

In view of John's frequent use of the word πιστεύειν in his Gospel,<sup>2</sup> its appearances in vv.48,50,53 are not

---

since it does not appear to be motivated by the question of the official.

<sup>1</sup>It should be noted that the father addresses Jesus with the word κύριε. Although κύριε is probably best rendered "sir" in this context, this word is frequently used by John as a Christological title.

<sup>2</sup>Only the verb πιστεύειν, not the noun πίστις,

unimportant. The story relates the progression of the man's faith from that which seeks signs to that which trusts solely in Jesus' word of promise and finally to a complete faith in the person of Jesus.<sup>1</sup> Schweizer<sup>2</sup> calls attention to this pattern of the development of the theme of faith in 4:46-54 and further notes that in this instance the official's faith, as referred to in v.50, which is not dependent upon seeing is consequently confirmed by the news of the healing; this "seeing" leads him to a deeper faith in Jesus (v.53). According to Schweizer, the crucial issue for the fourth evangelist was not if a sign was sought but whether or not the sign--in this case, the healing of the official's son--led the person to an authentic faith in Jesus.<sup>3</sup>

---

occurs in the fourth Gospel. It has been employed by John approximately eighty-seven times.

<sup>1</sup>Most commentators (Barrett, John, p. 227; Dodd, Hist. Tradition, p. 193; Bultmann, Johannes, pp. 153f.; Strathmann, p. 94; Fuller, Miracles, pp. 99f.) conclude that John has deliberately differentiated between the nature of faith in v.50 and that in v.53. In the final instance, πιστεύειν is used in an absolute sense to mean that the official and his household became Christians. The phrase καὶ ἐπίστευσεν αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ οἰκία αὐτοῦ ὅλη probably reflects early missionary terminology. Cf. Acts 16:15, 16:31-34, 18:8, 11:14 (10:2).

<sup>2</sup>Evangelische Theologie, 11 (1951-52), pp. 68-70.

<sup>3</sup>Brown, p. 195, comes to the same conclusion when he declares, "Therefore, to be precise, the pedagogy

As we have seen, John has reported that the first sign performed by Jesus in Cana (2:1-11) causes the disciples to believe in him. Now the second sign in Cana results in the conversion of the official and his household; they believe in Jesus as Lord and Saviour like those in the early Church. Unlike Mt. 8:5-13/Lk. 7:1-10, the fourth evangelist has not been concerned to use this story to address the issue about the rights of the Gentiles in the Kingdom. 4:46-54 presupposes a later time in the Church and has been tailored to demonstrate that authentic faith is that which perceives in the sign the true nature of the One who performs it. For John the important matter was not a faith in signs but a faith in Jesus to whom the signs point.<sup>1</sup>

---

was not to lead the official away from a faith based on signs; rather, it was to lead him to a faith that would not be based on the wondrous aspect of the sign but on what the sign would tell him about Jesus."

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Feuillet, *op. cit.*, pp. 34-46, who considers the relationship of 4:46-54 to both the section which precedes it and that which follows and concludes that it--with its emphasis on the verb ζῆν in vv. 50, 51, 53 and the theme of faith--was probably intended as a prelude to chapter 5, where Jesus is the life-giver (5:21ff.) and where in contrast to the faith of the official the disbelief of the Jewish authorities is stressed. Although the fourth evangelist has undoubtedly seen a connexion between 4:46-54 and that section which follows (whether it was chapter 5 or 6), the second Cana miracle parallels the first in 2:1-11 and stands as a separate unit without any explicitly worked out explanatory commentary.

The Healing of the Man at the Pool--  
5:1-18

In the present ordering of the chapters in the Gospel of John the scene in chapter 5 reverts to the feast in Jerusalem, and the fourth evangelist has included in vv.1-9 a story of healing which takes place at the pool in the vicinity of the "sheep gate" in the capital city. The miracle story itself unfolds in a fitting manner. From among the multitude of invalid and sick persons Jesus spies one man who has been ill for thirty-eight years (v.5).<sup>1</sup> Exhibiting more than normal human perception, Jesus knows that this man has been lying by the pool for a long time and, consequently, inquires if he wishes to be healed (v.6). Failing to recognize the real import of Jesus' question, the man begins to explain why he has not been cured by the waters of the pool (v.7). Jesus then declares to him, "Rise, take up your pallet, and walk" (v.8); thereupon, it is reported that the man is immediately healed, and taking up his pallet he walks (v.9a).

---

<sup>1</sup>Vv.3b,4--which explain that the waters of the pool possess a special healing power whenever an angel of the Lord troubles them--were added to the story at a later time in the light of v.7. Cf. Barrett, John, p. 211; Bultmann, Johannes, p. 180; Brown, p. 207, and Lightfoot, John, p. 149.

In recounting this story of healing in 5:1-9a it appears that John has drawn upon definite source material, although it is clear that it has little in common with any story in the Synoptic Gospels.<sup>1</sup> It is particularly important to observe that he has used the story in 5:5-9a as an introduction to the theological issue which dominates the narrative from v.9b onwards. With the interjection of the words, "Now that day was the sabbath" (v.9b), it becomes perfectly clear that John has not recounted the story of the healing of the man at the pool simply for its own sake; it provides the opponents of Jesus--designated as "the Jews" (vv.10,15,16,18)<sup>2</sup>--with

---

<sup>1</sup>Only the command of Jesus to the man in v.8 (ἔειπε ἄρον τὸν κράβατόν σου καὶ περιπάτει) corresponds with the first half of Jesus' words in Mk. 2:11 (ἔειπε ἄρον τὸν κράβατόν σου καὶ ἕνα εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου). Although Barrett, John, p. 212 (see also pp. 34-37), assumes that v.8 is a reminiscence of Mk. 2:11, it must be remembered that there are no other evidences in the Johannine story to suggest that the fourth evangelist had before him the Markan account when recounting 5:1-9. Dodd, Hist. Tradition, pp. 176f., and Bultmann, Johannes, p. 181, deny any dependence upon Mark at this point in the Johannine narrative.

<sup>2</sup>The fourth evangelist has regularly specified the enemies of Jesus as οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι (cf. 1:19; 2:18,20; 5:10,15,16,18; 6:41,52; 7:1,11,13,15,35; 8:22,48,52,57; 9:18,22; 10:19,24,31,33; 11:18,45f.,54; 13:33; 18:12,14,31,36,38; 19:7,12,14,31,38; 20:19). On the other hand, in some passages John has used οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι to refer to the Jewish people in general or to note those who believe in Jesus (cf. 8:31; 11:19,31,33,36,45; 12:9,11; 18:20; 19:20).



the opportunity to bring a charge against Jesus.

It is interesting to observe how the fourth evangelist has skilfully developed the narrative section in 5:10-18 to bring out this theme.<sup>1</sup> John has given no indication that "the Jews" are present to witness the healing of the man by Jesus; in fact, the actual account of the healing ends simply with a reference to the fact that the patient takes up his pallet and walks and mentions no reactions--either positive or negative--by the bystanders.<sup>2</sup> Consequently, the element of opposition is first introduced by the fourth evangelist in v.10, in which the Jews point out to the cured man that it is contrary to the sabbath regulations to carry his pallet.<sup>3</sup> Thus, the charge of breaking the sabbath is not initially directed against Jesus but against the healed man. The design of John is clear, however, since he was not really concerned with the Jews' criticism of the man. Rather,

---

<sup>1</sup>It seems likely that the fourth evangelist has more freely composed the narrative in 5:9bff.--with a smaller amount of source material at his disposal--than was the case in 5:1-9a.

<sup>2</sup>Reference is made to a crowd in v.13, but it is included at this point in order to explain why the cured man does not know the name of his healer.

<sup>3</sup>For the Rabbinical prohibitions concerning the carrying of a burden on the sabbath, cf. Strack-Billerbeck, vol. 2, pp. 454-461.

his purpose was to reveal the antipathy of the Jews towards Jesus and to explicate the theological implications involved in the sabbath question. By adroitly using the final miracle-producing words of Jesus to the man (v.8--*ἔγειρε ἄρον τὸν κράβατόν σου καὶ περιπάτει*) as a linking phrase (cf. vv.9,10,11,12), John has recounted how the Jews come to realize that it is really Jesus who has violated the sabbath by his healing the man. When the man is accused of breaking the sabbath (v.10), he averts the Jews' attention to his healer whose instructions he is merely following (v.11), and when he is then asked to identify the man who healed him (v.12), he cannot since, according to John, Jesus had withdrawn into the crowd after the healing (v.13). Jesus' final encounter with the man in the temple is essential to the narrative principally as a means of establishing the identity of Jesus since the man reports directly to the Jews (vv.14f.).<sup>1</sup> Finally, in v.16 the fourth evangelist

---

<sup>1</sup>It is impossible to determine how much meaning John has attached to Jesus' words to the man in the temple, "See, you are well! Sin no more, that nothing worse befall you" (v.14b). MacGregor, p. 170, and Loisy, *Quatrième Évangile*, pp. 205f., propose that, like the paralytic in Mk. 2:1-12, the cured man (representing Israel) goes to his house (the temple). Other commentators (Lagrange, *Jean*, p. 139, and Westcott, vol. 1, p. 185) suggest that the man has retired to the temple to give thanks and that Jesus seeks him out to emphasize

has inserted his comment, indicating that it was because of Jesus' healing on the sabbath that the Jews persecuted him.

If John had terminated the narrative at this point, his discussion of the sabbath controversy would have added essentially nothing to the picture given by the Synoptics, viz, Jesus demonstrates his lordship over the sabbath by his healings and thereby precipitates the anger of the Jewish leaders (cf. Mk. 2:23-3:6; Lk. 13:10-17; Lk. 14:1-6). In 5:17ff. the motive behind John's narrative becomes explicit, and it is at this point that the Johannine narrative has taken a somewhat different line from that of the Synoptic stories. On the one hand, the Synoptic writers have been principally concerned to establish Jesus' authority over the sabbath to liberate the early Christians from restrictive sabbatarian practices.<sup>1</sup> The fourth evangelist, on the other hand, has been far more interested to explore the

---

the spiritual lesson implicit in the cure. Although Jesus' words give evidence of the Jewish belief about the interrelationship of sickness and sin, it seems likely that John has intended v.14 primarily as a basis for v.15 (thus Bultmann, Johannes, p. 182).

<sup>1</sup>It must be admitted that in the Synoptic Gospels a Christological assertion is also involved as "the Son of man" saying in Mk. 2:28 demonstrates.

Christological implications in Jesus' claim of freedom from the sabbath regulations.<sup>1</sup> According to John, Jesus is justified in healing on the sabbath not merely because in this way he is accomplishing good (cf. Mk. 3:4 and Mt. 12:12b) but because he is the Son of God, divinely commissioned to do the work of the Father. Jesus answers, saying, "My Father is working still, and I am working" (v.17).<sup>2</sup> By means of this assertion the issue at stake has transcended a mere consideration of sabbath observance. For the fourth evangelist, the Jews seek to kill Jesus not only because he violates the sabbath but primarily because he claims equality with God (v.18).

What the fourth evangelist has recounted in vv.10-18 obviously represents for him an explanatory narrative about the healing done by Jesus which, according to v.9b, occurs on the sabbath and provides the link

---

<sup>1</sup>Bultmann, Johannes, p. 185, points this out when he states, "Vielmehr handelt es sich bei Joh nur um die Frage, ob das Sabbatgebot eine Bindung für den Offenbarer sei, und um seine, in der Ständigkeit des Offenbarerwirkens gegründete Freiheit." Cf. also Barrett, John, pp. 208f.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Dodd, Interpretation, pp. 320-323, who discusses the theme of the perpetual activity of God, which is suggested in this declaration of Jesus and further expounded in vv.19-30. See also Fuller, Miracles, pp. 100f. Perhaps for the fourth evangelist, Jesus' healing on the sabbath contributes to God's creative work (v.17).

to the discourse section in vv.19ff. This is the first time that John has followed a miracle story by a lengthy discourse section, in which he has drawn out the theological significance of the preceding deed of Jesus. In this way, he has presented his readers with a theological commentary on the reported episode. In vv.19ff. it is made clear that the Son is in the closest communion with the Father, sharing in the divine functions of granting life and exercising judgement, and his works are in fact the works of the Father, bearing witness to the fact that Jesus is sent from God (cf. 5:36). Although the fourth evangelist has not explicitly designated the healing and controversy reported in 5:1-18 as a sign, it is obvious, especially in the light of the discourse section (5:19ff.), that Jesus is the sole revealer of the glory of God. Because they have not accepted Jesus as sent in the Father's name, the Jews stand accused (cf. 5:37-47).

The Feeding of the Five Thousand--  
6:1-15

In 6:1-21 John has incorporated a narrative about two incidents in Jesus' ministry which are also related in the Synoptic Gospels (cf. Mk. 6:30-52 and parallels).



The same sequence is reported as in Mark--a boat trip, a miraculous feeding, and the episode involving Jesus' appearance on the water. In view of the numerous differences between the Johannine account and those in the Synoptic Gospels, it seems most likely that John was not here directly dependent upon one or more of these accounts but was employing an independent tradition.<sup>1</sup>

If, as it has sometimes been accepted,<sup>2</sup> in the

---

<sup>1</sup>There are certain words in 6:1-21 which appear in one or more of the Synoptic accounts but they usually occur in a different order or context. Particularly striking is the lack of verbal agreement between the key verse (6:11) and those in the other accounts (cf. Mk. 6:41; Mt. 14:19b; Lk. 9:16). In view of the following comparisons there exists no consistent verbal evidence that John has been dependent on one or more of the Synoptic Gospels: 6:5-- πολλὸς ὄχλος (cf. Mk. 6:34); 6:7-- διακοσίων δηναρίων (cf. Mk. 6:37); 6:9-- πέντε ἄρτους χρισθίνους (cf. Mk. 6:38; Mt. 14:17; Lk. 9:13); 6:10-- χόρτος (cf. Mk. 6:39 and Mt. 14:19); 6:10-- οἱ ἄνδρες . . . ὡς πεντακισχίλιοι (cf. Mk. 6:44; Mt. 14:21; Lk. 9:14); 6:10-- ἀνέκεσαν (cf. Mk. 6:40); 6:13-- δώδεκα κοφίνους κλασμάτων (cf. Mk. 6:43; Mt. 14:20; Lk. 9:17); 6:15-- τὸ ὄρος (cf. Mk. 6:46 and Mt. 14:23); 6:16-- ὡς δὲ ὄψια ἐγένετο (cf. Mk. 6:47a and Mt. 14:23b); 6:18-- ἀνέμου (cf. Mk. 6:48 and Mt. 14:24); 6:19-- σταδίου (cf. Mt. 14:24); 6:19-- περιπατοῦντα ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης (cf. Mk. 6:48 and Mt. 14:25); and 6:20-- ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Ἐγώ εἰμι, μὴ φοβεῖσθε (cf. Mk. 6:50 and Mt. 14:27). Cf. finally Brown, pp. 236-244, for his detailed discussion of the relationship of Jn. 6:1-15 to the Synoptic feeding narratives.

<sup>2</sup>Thus Bultmann, Johannes, p. 154f.; Bernard, vol. 1, pp. xviif.; MacGregor, pp. 124f.; Strathmann, pp. 96-98; and Lagrange, Jean, p. 160. Cf. also W. F.

original ordering of the material in John, chapter 6 came before chapter 5, the reference in 6:2 to the signs done by Jesus might be more easily explained. After Jesus' voyage to the other side of the Sea of Galilee, it is stated that " . . . a multitude followed him, because they saw the signs which he did on those who were diseased." If chapter 6 followed chapter 4, this notation would have referred back to the healing of the nobleman's son in 4:46-54, and, in addition, the allusion to the Passover feast in 6:4 might have been intended by John as an anticipation of 5:1, where it is indicated that Jesus went to the feast of the Jews in Jerusalem.<sup>1</sup>

In any case, what is particularly noteworthy for our purposes is the Johannine assertion that the people are attracted to Jesus because of his miracles. In v.14

---

Howard, The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation, pp. 113, 303. For a discussion of the transposition of chapters 5 and 6 by Bultmann as well as the introduction of certain reasons which suggest that the normal order might be correct, see D. M. Smith, Jr., The Composition and Order of the Fourth Gospel: Bultmann's Literary Theory (New Haven, Conn. and London, 1965), pp. 128-130. Cf. finally the discussion of Brown, pp. 235f.

<sup>1</sup>Further, Bultmann, Johannes, p. 155, supposes that chapter 5 (esp. 5:18) constitutes the basis for the declaration in 7:1, in which it is stated that Jesus avoids going about in Judea since the Jews are seeking to kill him.

the fourth evangelist has announced that the feeding itself is also seen by the people as a sign,<sup>1</sup> causing them to declare, "This is indeed the prophet who is come into the world!" Unlike the Synoptic writers John has presented the people as being partially aware of the importance of Jesus' action although, as 6:33 reveals, they do not understand its true significance. Jesus is the prophet (cf. also 1:21 and 1:25), and they are eager to make him their king (v.15);<sup>2</sup> it is this latter fact which causes him to withdraw again to the mountain by himself, thus preparing for the episode which is recounted in 6:16-21. In view of vv.14f., it is likely that the fourth evangelist has directed the reader's attention to Jesus in the story of the feeding, stressing its Christological significance. A number of features of the Johannine account substantiate this assumption. In the first place, it is Jesus who sees the crowd approaching and immediately concerns himself

---

<sup>1</sup>There is good support (including B and p<sup>75</sup>) for the reading ἡ ἐποίησεν σημεῖα. This is seemingly the more difficult reading since it could have been altered to the singular to apply to the immediately preceding miracle.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Hahn, p. 370, who, contrary to Bultmann (Johannes, p. 158), insists that Deut. 18:15ff. is background to Jn. 6:14f., in which the expectation of the eschatological prophet and the Messianic king are linked.

about their need; he begins by directing a question to Philip (v.5). In Mark the narrative unfolds differently since it is the disciples who broach the subject about the food for the crowd only after Jesus has taught the people late into the day (Mk. 6:35f.). From the outset of the story in the fourth Gospel, however, it is obvious that Jesus plans to perform a miracle. In v.6 John has particularly betrayed this design since he has portrayed Jesus as the divine Son who knows what he is going to do and only poses a question to Philip in order to test his disciple.<sup>1</sup> Philip's answer discloses that he does not comprehend the real import of Jesus' question; he thinks only in terms of physical bread (v.7).<sup>2</sup>

While, unlike the Synoptic writers, John has specifically named the disciples who participate in the scene--first Philip and then in v.8 Andrew, who calls Jesus' attention to the lad who has five barley loaves and two fish, it is nonetheless important to observe that Jesus dominates the remainder of the narrative.

---

<sup>1</sup>Bultmann, Johannes, p. 157, is probably correct in assigning v.6 to John's redaction. It appears likely that this insertion was intended primarily to highlight Jesus' divine foreknowledge and not simply as a testing of the faith of the disciple.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Lightfoot, John, p. 154.

He commands the people to be seated (v.10); he takes the loaves and having given thanks distributes them to those who are seated (v.11); and after they have eaten their fill he instructs his disciples to collect the left-over fragments (v.12). Although it is implied that the disciples seat the men (v.10--κοιῶνται) and explicitly stated that they gather up the fragments of the barley loaves into twelve baskets (v.13), it is striking that Jesus himself distributes the bread to the men.<sup>1</sup>

Throughout the Johannine narrative, Jesus is the principal actor; he is the one who miraculously feeds the people with bread. It is on the basis of this episode that the fourth evangelist has brought out in the latter part of the chapter the profound significance of Jesus' action and has shown that the people who recognize the feeding as a sign (v.14) must be led into the deeper meaning of its significance.

#### Jesus' Walking on the Water--6:16-21

In Mk. 6:46 it is reported that Jesus withdraws to the mountain to pray after he has sent his disciples ahead to Bethsaida and has dismissed the crowd (cf.

---

<sup>1</sup>In the Synoptic accounts Jesus relays the bread to the disciples who in turn distribute it to the multitude (cf. Mk. 6:41; Mt. 14:19; Lk. 9:16).



also Mt. 14:22f.). As we have already noted, it is the people's desire to make Jesus their king by force which in John provides the reason for Jesus' retreat to the mountain by himself (v.15--*κάλιν εἰς τὸ ὄρος*);<sup>1</sup> neither the dismissal of the crowd nor the movement of the disciples is mentioned. According to v.16, the disciples are left on their own and with the coming of evening they go down to the sea to commence their voyage to Capernaum. If the latter half of v.17 is taken to be the thoughts of the disciples, then it seems to be misplaced and should come before v.17. Rather it makes more sense as a comment of the fourth evangelist which is intended to prepare for the miraculous occurrence to follow. Unlike Mk. 6:48 and Mt. 14:24, where it is the danger in which the disciples find themselves which prompts Jesus to come to them on the water, the words *καὶ σκοτία ἤδη ἐγγόνει καὶ οὐκ ἔληλύθει πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς* (v.17b) suggest that for John the essential point of the story resides in Jesus' walking upon the water.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>It is interesting to note that Jesus and his disciples are on the mountain in v.3 (*εἰς τὸ ὄρος*), but the feeding presumably occurs on level ground although this is never stated. It is nowhere stated that they were in the wilderness.

<sup>2</sup>Brown, pp. 254f., emphasizes the same point when he says, "The most plausible explanation is that John

In v.18 John has noted the disturbance of the sea by a strong wind, but nowhere has he stressed the perilous situation of the disciples. When Jesus does come to the disciples walking on the water, they are afraid (v.19-- καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν) as is the case in Mk. 6:50 and Mt. 14:26. John has not indicated, however, that the disciples initially perceive Jesus to be a ghost (cf. Mk. 6:49 and Mt. 14:26). Moreover, the fourth evangelist has completed his account by stating that they want to receive Jesus into the boat after he has spoken the words, 'Εγώ εἰμι, μὴ φοβεῖσθε (v.20). The οὖν in v.21 suggests that these words of Jesus immediately dispel the disciples' fears, permitting them to recognize him as their divine master.<sup>1</sup> The final sentence in the Johannine version does not mention a miraculous cessation of the storm but the immediate arrival of the boat at its destination (v.21b--" . . . and immediately the boat was at the land

---

treats the scene as a divine epiphany centered on the expression egō eimi in vs. 20." He subsequently suggests that this epiphany of Jesus on the water was perhaps intended by John as a corrective to the crowd's recognition of Jesus as prophet and king (vv.14f.). As 6:16-21 reveals, Jesus is much more than a political Messiah. Cf. also Bultmann, Johannes, p. 159.

<sup>1</sup> Although the Johannine ending does not make explicit the response of those in the boat to the miracle of Jesus, it has much more in common with Mt. 14:33 than with Mk. 6:52.

to which they were going"). Undoubtedly, John has intended this latter event as a miracle too.<sup>1</sup> In conclusion, it can be said that the fourth evangelist has fashioned the story of Jesus' walking on the water to contribute to the Christological meaning of chapter 6 and not to stress the theme of discipleship. The fact that the Johannine account is apparently written from the point of view of the disciples further underlines this since their attention (as well as the reader's) is directed towards Jesus. As the Son of God, Jesus reveals himself to his disciples by joining them on the water and miraculously brings them to their destination.

6:22ff.--By means of vv.22-24<sup>2</sup> and particularly the people's question to Jesus on the next day (v.25), John has further drawn attention to both the feeding miracle and the manifestation of Jesus on the water. Jesus' answer, "Truly, truly, I say to you, you seek me, not

---

<sup>1</sup>Bultmann, Johannes, p. 159, declares, " . . . zum Wunder des Seewandelns kommt also noch die wunderbare Landung." Cf. also Barrett, John, p. 234.

<sup>2</sup>In particular, the words εὐχαριστήσαντες τοῦ κυρίου, if original, lay additional stress on the Eucharistic import of the feeding episode. Cf. Brown, p. 259, who also notes that in v.24 it is no longer loaf in the plural form (vv.5,7,9,11,13) but τὸν ἄρτον; this is " . . . a seeming concession to the eucharistic language of the NT."

because you saw signs, but because you ate your fill of the loaves" (v.26) suggests that, for John, both the feeding miracle and Jesus' appearance on the water constituted signs even though they are not recognized as such. It is then reported that Jesus launches into an extensive explanation and draws out the real significance of the feeding miracle. He points his audience to the imperishable bread which he is able to give them, but they misunderstand and seek a sign from him that he is sent from God (v.30). In other words, the people seek a sign from Jesus and fail to perceive that Jesus is the sign; his teaching and, in fact, his person are "the bread of life" (v.35). The Johannine Jesus responds to the Jews who hesitate to accept his assertion that he is " . . . the bread which came down from heaven" since they know his earthly father and mother by reaffirming that the Father has sent him and that those who partake of his flesh will never die in contrast to the Israelites who perished in the wilderness despite the fact that they ate the manna (cf. vv.41-51).

There can be no doubt that vv.51b-58 allude to the Eucharist of the early Church in which the Christians partook of the "flesh" and "blood" of Jesus; it has been

questioned, however, especially by Bultmann,<sup>1</sup> if this section were part of the original Gospel. Although we dare not devote too much space to the consideration of this, it seems fair to say that Bultmann's argument that vv.51b-58 constitute a later insertion into the Gospel is not wholly convincing. In his detailed analysis of this section, Bultmann must constantly admit that the redactor has taken up Johannine themes appearing elsewhere in the Gospel.<sup>2</sup> If these verses compose an

---

<sup>1</sup>Johannes, pp. 161f., 174-177. Cf. C. Dekker, "Grundskrift und Redaktion im Johannesevangelium," N.T.S., 13 (October, 1966), pp. 66-78, who on the basis of an analysis of the words οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι and ὁ ὄχλος throughout the fourth Gospel suggests that the whole of chapter 6 was added by a later redactor since these words are used differently in that chapter.

<sup>2</sup>For example, in v.51b the καὶ ὁ ἄρτος δέ . . . (Bultmann, Johannes, p. 174) is not contrary to John's style; the introductory words in v.53 Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν is characteristic of John (cf. 1:51; 5:19,24,25; 6:26,32,47; 8:34,51,58; 10:1,7; 12:24; 13:16,20,21; 14:12; 16:20,23); the use of the title "the Son of man" in v.53 to identify Jesus is also found in 6:27 (cf., however, ibid., pp. 166,175); the words ἐν ἐμοὶ μένει καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ in v.56 is a Johannine formula (ibid., p. 176--Bultmann, however, refers to 15:4f. and 17:21-23, where the relationship of faith to Jesus is being described); the thought in v.57 seems to reflect those in 5:21,26 (ibid., p. 176); the words ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς in v.58 revert to the theme expounded in v.51a and especially in vv.33,50 (ibid., p. 176); and, finally, the reference to the gift of eternal life in the latter half of v.58 resumes the theme set forth in vv.31f.,49, in which "the bread of life" is contrasted to the manna (ibid., p. 176).



interpolation, then the redactor has painstakingly fashioned his insertion to fit the Johannine context. In the final analysis, it becomes clear that Bultmann assigns this sacramental section to a later redactor on the basis of theological rather than stylistic evidence. In his estimation, 6:51b-58--as various other passages--are not in line with the fourth evangelist's theological viewpoint.<sup>1</sup> It would seem, however, that vv.51b-58 are not inappropriate to chapter 6 but seemingly essential to the progression of the theme from One whose teaching reveals the will of the Father and who is himself "the bread come down from heaven" to that same One who, subsequent to his death (v.51c),<sup>2</sup> shares his life-giving

---

<sup>1</sup>Bultmann's most valid points (*Johannes*, pp. 162, 175f.) for his conclusion are the following: he claims that the phrase in v.54 *καὶ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ* does not correspond to the Johannine eschatology (cf. 3:18f.; 5:24f.; 11:25f.), but in order to sustain this claim Bultmann is required to conclude that the similar references in vv.39,40,44 were inserted to adjust vv.27-51a to the view of vv.51b-58; and he argues that the response of the Jews is patterned after a normal Johannine practice (cf. 6:42; 3:4,9) but, unlike John, their misunderstanding is not rooted in the Johannine dualism. This latter point cannot be sustained since, according to John, the misunderstanding revolves around the meaning of Jesus' saying about "his flesh"--the Jews think in terms of eating physical flesh while John was making reference to the benefits which will flow from his death (through the Eucharist).

<sup>2</sup>The words in v.51 *καὶ ὁ ἄρτος δὲ ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω ἡ σὰρξ μου ἐστὶν ὑπερ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς* are probably intended as a

power with those in the Church through the Eucharist; therefore, we hesitate to accept the radical solution of Bultmann.<sup>1</sup>

As in chapter 5, the fourth evangelist has appended a long discourse section to the opening narrative. As we

---

reference to Jesus' death. Cf. Mk. 14:24; Rom. 8:32; I Cor. 15:3; II Cor. 5:21; Gal. 1:4, 2:20, 3:13; Heb. 2:9

<sup>1</sup>Although certain modern commentators (e.g., Barrett, John, pp. 235f.; Howard, I.B., vol. 8, pp. 537f.; Dodd, Interpretation, pp. 338-340) readily conclude that John has alluded to the Eucharist in vv. 51b-58, they do not apparently take very seriously Bultmann's position. Only Barrett (John, p. 236; see also pp. 18-21) in passing states, "The thought of the discourse as a whole is coherent; it is not necessary to regard vv. 51b-8 as an interpolation in the interests of eucharistic doctrine." Cf. Smith, op. cit., pp. 133-139, who explains Bultmann's internal rearrangement of chapter 6 and his assignment of certain verses to the ecclesiastical redactor. On pp. 142-148, Smith attempts to demonstrate the fourth evangelist's development in chapter 6, stressing the importance of v. 51c (which Bultmann assigns to the redactor) with its allusion to Jesus' death as the fitting culmination to the preceding discourse and the transition to the sacramental section. According to Smith, John has in this way emphasized that the eating of Jesus' "flesh" and the drinking of his "blood" do not produce a magical effect but are a participation in the Lord's death and thus are anchored to a point in history. Although Brown, pp. 285f., would concede that vv. 51-58 might have been added in a late stage of the editing of chapter 6, he asserts that (contrary to Bultmann) this section does not introduce a non-Johannine sacramental theme but only makes explicit the Eucharistic undertones in vv. 35-50. Cf. P. Borgen, "The Unity of the Discourse in John 6," Z.N.W., 50 (1959), pp. 277f., who argues for the unity of chapter 6 as a midrashic interpretation of v. 31, and J. Jeremias, "Joh 6:51c-58--redaktionell?", Z.N.W., 44 (1952-53), pp. 256f.

have seen, in both 6:1-14 and 6:16-21 he has focused the reader's attention on the action of Jesus and in both instances it is seen by the people as a sign. It is by means of 6:26ff. that John has stressed the deeper significance behind these signs. Although at first it does not appear that the fourth evangelist has specifically tailored 6:1-13 to prepare for "the bread of life" theme with its Eucharistic implications, there are a number of items worth noting. The reference to the Passover is frequently seen as a Johannine insertion to call attention to the Eucharistic significance of chapter 6,<sup>1</sup> but more important than this are the references to the inexhaustible supply of bread (vv.11b,12a-- ὅσον ἤθελον ὥς δὲ ἐνεπλήσθησαν) and to Jesus' order that all the left-over bread be collected so that nothing is lost (v.12b-- ἵνα μή τι ἀπόληται). Although the fish are mentioned somewhat as an afterthought in v.11b (ὁμοίως καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρίων), it is elsewhere obvious that John was primarily interested in the bread. It is the bread which Jesus takes and after giving thanks distributes to the crowd (v.11a), and it is only the fragments of the barley

---

<sup>1</sup>Thus Dodd, Interpretation, p. 333; Barrett, John, p. 228; Lagrange, Jean, pp. 161f.; Strathmann, p. 112; MacGregor, p. 128; and Loisy, Quatrième Évangile, p. 223. For the contrary position, see Bultmann, Johannes, p. 156.

loaves which are gathered by the disciples (v.13). In John it is almost exclusively the miracle of the bread. All this is fitting in view of the discussion in the remainder of the chapter. In addition, Daube<sup>1</sup> makes the following observations on the basis of a careful comparison of the key verses in the Johannine account with those in the Synoptic versions: in Mk. 6:42f. and Mk. 8:8 the actions of eating and of being satisfied and of taking up the remains are reported in main clauses and are equally stressed; in John, however, it is the references to the distribution of the inexhaustible amount of bread (v.11-- ἔλαβεν οὖν τοὺς ἄρτους ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εὐχαριστήσας διέδωκεν τοῖς ἀνακειμένοις, . . . ὅσον ἤθελον) and the collection of the remaining bread, not the eating and being filled (vv.12f), which are in the main clauses.<sup>2</sup> This leads Daube to conclude that for John the plentiful distribution represents the first miracle and the gathering of the remains constitutes the second miracle. In vv.12f. attention is directed to this latter event since Jesus gives a fresh command to his disciples. Although

---

<sup>1</sup>D. Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism (London, 1956), pp. 36ff.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 38-40. Cf. also Dodd, Interpretation, pp. 333f.



Daube perhaps underestimates the importance for John of the crowd's eating, he rightly asserts that the fourth evangelist has placed primary emphasis upon the inexhaustible supply of bread and its imperishable nature--with the concern that nothing be lost<sup>1</sup>--since more is gathered than there was at the beginning. In this way he has prepared for the following section in which Jesus is declared to be "the bread which has come down from heaven." In other words, the features of the feeding miracle to which the fourth evangelist has drawn attention find their fulfilment in the ensuing discussion.

6:64f.--As a result of Jesus' word in the synagogue at Capernaum (v.59) there arises a division among those who accompany him. What is noteworthy for our purposes is the fact that the Johannine Jesus has known from the beginning those who would not believe and the one who would betray him (cf. vv.70f.). Whether ἐξ ἀρχῆς refers

---

<sup>1</sup>Barrett, John, pp. 230, suggests that by means of the words ἵνα μὴ τι ἀπόληται John might have been alluding to the ingathering of Christian disciples as well as referring to the Eucharist. Cf. also F.-M. Braun, "Quatre 'signes' johanniques de l'unité chrétienne," N.T.S., 9 (1962-63), pp. 147f., who, assuming that the Johannine feeding narrative possesses Eucharistic significance, interprets Jesus' command in v.12 to mean that the scattered children of God will be gathered from the foreign nations (cf. 11:52) and that the "left-over" bread represents the Eucharistic bread destined for the nations that all might be one in Christ.



to the beginning of Jesus' ministry (cf. 16:4) or to the pre-existence of the Son of God, his foreknowledge is still being stressed by the fourth evangelist.

7:3-9--Irrespective of the validity of the rearrangement theories, we can consider these verses in their present context. The brothers of Jesus urge him to go into Judea in order that his disciples may also behold the works which he is doing (v.3--ἵνα καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ σου θεωρήσουσιν τὰ ἔργα [σου] ἃ ποιεῖς).<sup>1</sup> By means of vv.4f. John has made it clear that their request does not issue from faith and that they totally miscomprehend the significance of Jesus' miracles. They presume that a public display of Jesus' power will have convincing value; however, rejecting their proposal Jesus chooses to go to the feast in private (7:10) since his time had not yet come (v.6--ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐμός),<sup>2</sup> suggesting that going to

---

<sup>1</sup>It should be noted that the word ἔργα, not σημεῖα, is used here to describe Jesus' miracles. In addition, it would appear that the words οἱ μαθηταὶ σου refer to a wider circle of Jesus' adherents than just the twelve. Could this be an allusion to those who were previously attracted by his signs (cf. 2:23) or a reference to those followers who have just broken away from Jesus (cf. 6:66)? Cf. Barrett, John, pp. 256f., and Bultmann, Johannes, pp. 218f.

<sup>2</sup>The word καιρὸς signifies a determined point in time (in this case, established by the Father) and possibly is to be associated with the Johannine concept of "my hour has not yet come." Cf. above, p. 400.

Judea (hence, Jerusalem) would incite hatred and bring his death (cf. 7:1,7). In the fourth Gospel Jesus is guided by a divine plan and not the whims of man.

7:10ff.--After Jesus does go up to Jerusalem, there is an obvious division among the people at the feast regarding him (cf. esp. 7:43). Like his deeds his teaching provokes amazement, in this instance among the Jews who question how this uneducated man can possess such learning (7:15). In his rebuttal to them, he openly draws attention to the fact that they seek to kill him, at which time the people<sup>1</sup> accuse him of having a demon, i.e., being mad, for entertaining such a thought (7:19f.). It is then that Jesus alludes to the sabbath healing already reported in 5:1ff. which, according to John, precipitates the Jews' plot against Jesus (7:21-23; cf. esp. 5:16). As in the former incident in which John has made it clear that it was really Jesus' Christological claim and not the sabbath violation which was at stake (cf. 5:18), 7:25ff. reveal that the crucial issue is whether or not Jesus is the Christ. There is debate among the

---

<sup>1</sup>It is noteworthy that it is the crowd (v.20-- ὁ ὄχλος), not the Jews, who repudiates Jesus' claim that his life is being sought. According to John, the Jewish authorities are responsible for planning Jesus' death. Cf. Barrett, John, p. 263, and Bultmann, Johannes, p. 222.

people; the authorities attempt to arrest him but cannot because "his hour had not yet come" (7:30); and many from the crowd believe in him on account of his signs, for they question, "When the Christ appears, will he do more signs than this man has done?" (7:31b-- ὁ χριστὸς ὅταν ἔλθῃ μὴ κλείονα σημεῖα ποιήσει ὧν οὗτος ἐποίησεν;). Again, it seems doubtful that John would have viewed the faith which results merely from an acknowledgement of the signs to be totally adequate (cf. 2:23-25). Finally, in 7:45ff. the fourth evangelist has indicated that the Jewish authorities (the chief priests and the Pharisees) are fearful that there is dissension even in their own ranks and that certain of the authorities and Pharisees are being attracted to Jesus since the temple officers are clearly impressed by Jesus' words.<sup>1</sup>

8:12ff.--The increasing hostility against Jesus is further emphasized by John in chapter 8 until the breach between him and the Jewish authorities becomes irreparable. Certain of the Jews believe in Jesus because of

---

<sup>1</sup>It is interesting to note that John has mentioned Nicodemus (cf. 3:1ff.) in v.50 subsequent to the discussion among the authorities about losing those in their number to Jesus, but it is doubtful if the words εἰς ὧν ἐξ αὐτῶν allude to Nicodemus' inclusion among Jesus' disciples.

his words (8:30),<sup>1</sup> but the ensuing dialogue demonstrates that their faith, like the initial faith based on the observance of signs, is not that of true disciples (cf. 8:31ff.). In fact, Jesus accuses the Jews of being children of the Devil (v.44) because they fail to believe his words. This implies that Jesus is the true Son of the Father. Once again the Jews charge that Jesus is speaking irresponsibly and has a demon (8:48,52).<sup>2</sup> The discussion, most of which centres around the theme of the actual origin of Jesus and his relationship to Abraham, culminates in the Jews' attempt to stone Jesus; however, he escapes from them and leaves the temple (8:59).

---

<sup>1</sup>Brown, pp. 351,354f., suspects that the references in v.30 to believers and in v.31a to believing "Jews" were not included in the earliest form of John's Gospel but were introduced in successive stages of the Johannine redaction since they do not seem appropriate to the wider context.

<sup>2</sup>In 8:48 Jesus is jointly attacked as being a Samaritan and having a demon. Clearly both references are intended in a derogatory fashion. It is probably in view of Jesus' denial of the Jews' claim to be the true children of Abraham (8:39ff.) and the question about Jesus' real origin (cf. 7:27-29,41f.,52; 8:14,23,41f.) that he is viciously labelled a Samaritan, i.e., a half-breed and not a true Jew himself. Cf. MacGregor, p. 221, and Hoskyns, vol. 2, pp. 396f. Cf. further Bultmann, Johannes, p. 225.

The Healing of the Man Born Blind--  
9:1-41

The fourth evangelist has probably employed the words καὶ καράγων (9:1) to link the story of the healing of the blind man with the preceding episode,<sup>1</sup> and it becomes apparent in 9:5 that he has intended this incident involving the restoration of the man's sight as a concrete demonstration of a theme which is basic to the Gospel of John and which is emphasized in the previous chapter when Jesus declares, "I am the light of the world; he who follows me will not walk in darkness, but will have the light of life" (8:12). As this theme is set forth in the prologue (cf. 1:4-10) and developed throughout the Gospel (cf. 3:19-21; 12:35f., 46-48), it is seen to have two aspects: life for those who behold Jesus as "the light of the world" and judgement for all who choose to remain in darkness. By fashioning chapter 9 as one continuous narrative section, John has been able to provide for his readers a dramatic illustration of the truth of this saying.

The Johannine story has no direct parallel in the Synoptic Gospels, but it is likely that the fourth

---

<sup>1</sup>This is contrary to the opinion of Bultmann, Johannes, p. 250.



evangelist had source material at his disposal, at least for vv.1-7. Nonetheless, it would appear that the whole of the chapter has been rewritten to such an extent that it is no longer possible to detect with certainty the traditional material. The development of the incident in chapter 9 generally corresponds with that of the story of healing in 5:1-18. In each case the healing by Jesus prompts a charge regarding the violation of the sabbath; the opponents of Jesus learn of it only after they have questioned the healed man; Jesus encounters the patient a second time in a different setting; and finally face to face with his accusers Jesus makes definite Christological claims for himself.<sup>1</sup> As we have already noted, chapter 9 constitutes one extended narrative section and, unlike chapter 5, John has not chosen to elucidate the theological significance of the reported healing by appending a lengthy discourse section with Jesus as teacher.<sup>2</sup>

The story proper is introduced by a question from

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Bultmann, Johannes, p. 249, and Hoskyns, vol. 2, p. 416.

<sup>2</sup>Dodd, Interpretation, p. 357, says, "We observe that in this episode the significance of the σημειον is divulged, not in an accompanying discourse, but by brief insertions into the narrative itself."

Jesus' disciples. The reference to the fact that the man was born blind (9:1--τυφλὸν ἐκ γενετῆς) forms the necessary basis for their inquiry about whose sin caused this to happen (v.2). Although the statement of the Pharisees in v.34 is a possible allusion to v.2, it is clear that for John the real issue of this story did not reside in the question about the relationship between sin and blindness (i.e., physical abnormality). John has viewed this as another occasion on which the works of God are manifested (v.3b-- ἵνα φανερωθῇ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ). In other words, the fourth evangelist has immediately brought into the foreground the Christological import of the situation. V.4, in which the references to "day" and "night" probably allude respectively to the remaining time in which Jesus must accomplish his Father's work and the hour of his Passion,<sup>1</sup> prepares for his announcement in v.5 that only for a limited time is he to be the light of the world. Significantly,

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. 11:8-10, 12:32-36 and 13:30, where νύξ (σκότια) is closely associated with Jesus' departure, i.e., the time of his Passion. The plural pronoun ὑμεῖς in v.4 is probably the original reading and is perhaps an example of anachronistic reference to the participation of the early Christians in the work of Jesus. Dodd, Hist. Tradition, p. 188, points to 3:11 and 4:22 as two other examples of the same phenomenon.

following upon this declaration Jesus takes the initiative and proceeds to restore the man's eyesight by making clay from the earth and his spittle, anointing the man's eyes with this clay and instructing him to wash in the pool of Siloam. After the man carries out Jesus' orders, he returns with restored eyesight (vv.6f.).<sup>1</sup>

Using a technique similar to that in the story of the lame man (5:1ff.), the fourth evangelist has had the cured man reiterate the means by which he has received his eyesight both in response to the neighbours' debate concerning him (v.11) and the Pharisees' inquiry (v.15b). Again (cf. 5:9b), almost as an afterthought, the fourth evangelist has noted that Jesus accomplishes the healing on a sabbath day (v.14). Initially, the Pharisees attempt to establish that Jesus is not from God because he does not keep the sabbath, but not all

---

<sup>1</sup>As early as Irenaeus, Jesus' use of the clay was seen as an allusion to God's creative action in Gen. 2:7 (cf. van der Loos, pp. 426f.; Lightfoot, John, p. 202; Hoskyns, vol. 2, pp. 407f.). Lagrange, Jean, p. 261, however, concludes that this analogy is remote since it is after the washing in the pool, not just the application of the clay, that the man's eyesight is restored. The technique of employing saliva is noted elsewhere as part of a miracle story (cf. Mk. 8:22-26), and we have no guarantee that John has attached specific symbolic meaning to this feature.

of them are in agreement since, according to some, no sinner can perform such signs. It becomes obvious that, as in the previous chapters, the principal issue centres around Jesus' claims for himself--is he merely a man or the divine representative from the Father?

By repeated interrogation the Pharisees endeavour--almost fanatically, it seems--to prove that Jesus is a sinner. When they derive no satisfaction from the healed man's answer (v.17b--"He is a prophet"), they call in his parents and question them (vv.18-23). His parents surrender little information, for, as John has indicated, they fear the Jews since they know that any one confessing Jesus to be the Christ would be expelled from the synagogue; consequently, the Jews try a second time to wring the desired confession out of the man himself (cf. vv.24-34). In the second half of this chapter the fourth evangelist has skilfully written the narrative to show that the accusers, the Jews, become the accused.<sup>1</sup> The cured man, in fact, does not yield in the face of their threatening interrogation but progressively asserts his position more confidently.

---

<sup>1</sup>Brown, p. 377, rightly observes, "The blind man's confutation of the Pharisees in vss. 24-34 is one of the most cleverly written dialogues in the NT."

Having already in the previous encounter (v.17) given his opinion that Jesus must be a prophet, he now not only remains uncommitted as to whether or not Jesus is a sinner (v.25) but also eventually--taking up the previous argument in v.16--almost sarcastically asserts that one who opens the eyes of the blind undoubtedly must be from God (v.33). Having previously suggested that the man has become a disciple of Jesus while they are disciples of Moses (v.28), the Jews expel him (from the synagogue) and apparently dismiss his testimony as being invalid since he was born in utter sin (v.34).

John's masterful treatment of the blind man's involvement in the chapter comes to its fruition in the last scene, in which Jesus seeks out the expelled one and by revealing who he really is leads the man to (Christian) faith. Jesus' words, "You have seen him . . . " (v.37), undoubtedly were intended by John to convey a double meaning in view of the man's former blindness. He responds by saying, "Lord, I believe," and he worships him (v.38).<sup>1</sup> In other words, the gift

---

<sup>1</sup>The development of the conversation between Jesus and the man, which results in this confession, resembles that between Jesus and the Samaritan woman (cf. esp. 4:24-26). In 9:35 the reading τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is better attested than τοῦ θεοῦ and is probably original. The man's final response (πιστεύω, κύριε καὶ προσεκύνησεν



of his eyesight enables the man to see and believe in Jesus. Finally, in v.29 the fourth evangelist has succinctly set forth the theme which permeates the entire narrative in chapter 9. Jesus declares, "For judgement I came into this world, that those who do not see may see, and that those who see may become blind."<sup>1</sup> The question of the Pharisees in vv.40f. serves to underline this Johannine emphasis. It is those who are willing to admit their spiritual blindness who receive the sight which can come only from God.<sup>2</sup> Brown sums up well the lesson of chapter 9 when he states,

---

ἀόρατος) was undoubtedly fashioned in the light of the worship of the early Church. The verb *προσκυβεῖν* also occurs in the fourth Gospel in the story of the Samaritan woman (4:20-24) and in 12:20. Cf. D. Mollat, "La guérison de l'aveugle-né," *Bible et Vie chrétienne*, 23 (1958), pp. 29f., who draws attention to the theme of faith in this chapter.

<sup>1</sup>The negative portion of this Johannine formulation of Jesus' words is reminiscent of Mk. 4:11 with Is. 6:9f. as its Old Testament background. John has actually referred to Is. 6:10 in 12:40 as an explanation for the disbelief of many of the Jews.

<sup>2</sup>Certain commentators (Barrett, *John*, p. 294; Lightfoot, *John*, p. 199; Strathmann, p. 161) suppose that by noting that the man was born blind the fourth evangelist has intended this man as a representative of unregenerate mankind (born spiritually blind) in need of God's gift of sight. It does seem probable that John would have seen the words *τυφλὸν ἐκ γενετῆς* as more than simply a descriptive detail of the miracle story.

This is a story of how a man who sat in darkness was brought to see the light, not only physically but spiritually. On the other hand, it is also a tale of how those who thought they saw (the Pharisees) were blinding themselves to the light and plunging into darkness. The story starts in vs. 1 with a blind man who will gain his sight; it ends in vs. 41 with the Pharisees who have become spiritually blind."<sup>1</sup>

10:19-21--Following the discourse section in chapter 10, John has once again drawn attention to the division among the Jews on account of Jesus--this time because of his words. He has referred back to Jesus' healing of the blind man in chapter 9 as support for the argument of some of the Jews who believe that Jesus does not have a demon.

10:22-39--The question of whether or not Jesus is really the Messiah is openly posed by the Jews in this section (v.24). In the face of the Jews' disbelief, Jesus reiterates that his works are done in the name of the Father and bear witness to his divine status. When the Jews are about to stone Jesus, they admit that it is not because of his good works but because he blasphemes by claiming to be as God (v.33).

In v.37 John has developed the following argument: if the works of Jesus do not possess revelatory value,

---

<sup>1</sup>p. 377.

then the Jews need not believe the words of Jesus; if, however, his works are good, the Jews must acknowledge this fact even if they deny the claims of the one who accomplished them. According to John, words need not have convincing force but works (acts) do, and if the works of Jesus are acknowledged for what they are this will lead a person to perceive their deeper meaning regarding the unique relationship of Jesus with the Father.<sup>1</sup> In this instance, these words of Jesus do not soften the hostility of the Jews, and they again seek in vain to arrest Jesus.

10:40-42--It is implied in v.39 that Jesus miraculously escapes from his enemies' hands, and in v.40 it is reported that he travels into the Trans-Jordan area, where John the Baptist had worked. The fourth evangelist has in these three verses deliberately contrasted the Baptist and Jesus. Unlike Jesus, the Baptist did no sign,<sup>2</sup> but it is emphasized that his sole mission was

---

<sup>1</sup>The words ἵνα γινώτε καὶ γινώσκητε ὅτι ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ πατήρ καὶ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ imply a future possibility (cf. Dodd, Interpretation, pp. 164,397). Cf. the interesting discussion of Bultmann (Johannes, pp. 297f.), who interprets ἔργα as a reference to the entire revelatory work of Jesus.

<sup>2</sup>Since, according to the Johannine design, the signs are so intimately associated with the person of the revealer of the Father, it is impossible for the

to point to Jesus as the Messiah (cf. 1:19ff.). Perhaps the fourth evangelist has intended the final note that many believe in Jesus to be seen as a consequence of the Baptist's testimony in that area as well as a contrast to the lack of faith which Jesus had encountered in Judea. This retreat of Jesus prepares for his final return to Jerusalem.

### The Raising of Lazarus--11:1-53

In this chapter the supreme sign accomplished by Jesus is recounted. The story of the raising of Lazarus represents the dramatic turning point in John's presentation of the ministry of Jesus. The chapter contains such a carefully worked out narrative that it is impossible to ascertain its pre-Johannine form,<sup>1</sup> but, in any case, our primary concern is to determine the Johannine purpose for the inclusion of this narrative in his Gospel.

---

Baptist to perform signs. At the outset of the Gospel he denies that he is the Christ (cf. 1:19-28). Cf. E. Bammel, "'John Did No Miracle': John 10.41," Miracles, ed. C. F. D. Moule, pp. 179-202. Cf. also Brown, p. 415.

<sup>1</sup>Cf. esp. Dodd, Hist. Tradition, p. 228. Cf., however, W. Wilkens, "Die Erweckung des Lazarus," Theologische Zeitschrift, 15 (1959), esp. pp. 23-28, who not only suggests the possible pre-Johannine shape of the story but also its probable form in the earlier tradition.

The narrative itself unfolds in a sequence of five scenes: the report of Lazarus' illness to Jesus and the subsequent conversation between Jesus and his disciples (vv.1-16); Jesus' encounter with Martha near Bethany (vv.17-27); his meeting the other sister, Mary, in the same location with certain of the Jews as observers (vv.28-37); Jesus' arrival at the tomb and the resulting miracle (vv.38-45); and, finally, the description of the differing responses to the deed of Jesus (vv.45-53).

The theme of chapter 11 is brought out most clearly in the second scene in which Jesus is talking with Martha. She laments the fact that Jesus' late arrival seemingly precludes the possibility that he can now help since her brother has already been in the tomb for four days (cf. vv.17ff.) for she assumes that Jesus could have healed Lazarus; it should be noted, however, that she still exhibits a certain degree of faith, as her words in v.22 show. When Jesus says, "Your brother will rise again," her reply discloses that she misunderstands the real import of his statement since she does not comprehend that Jesus is life itself. Jesus' declaration, "I am the resurrection and the life . . . ," and his inquiry if she believes this prompts Martha to respond



positively with a full Christological confession (v.27--  
Ναί, κύριε, ἐγὼ πεπίστευχα ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ  
εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐρχόμενος). John's use of the perfect tense  
of πιστεύειν is characteristic of him<sup>1</sup> and suggests that,  
according to the Johammine conception, Martha and her  
sister have existed in a relationship of faith to Jesus  
prior to this incident. The entire story presumes a  
previous close tie between them and Jesus (v.5); they  
continually designate him as the Lord (κύριος--vv.2,3,  
21,27,32,39);<sup>2</sup> and Martha's statement in v.22 exhibits  
a confidence in Jesus' intimate relationship with God  
who will grant whatever he requests.

Thus in this atmosphere of trust it is demonstrated  
that faith in Jesus means resurrection and eternal life.

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. esp. 6:69 and 16:27. Cf. Barrett, John, pp. 253,330. As Barrett notes, Martha's words could have been formed on the basis of some primitive creedal statement used in the Church (thus also Bultmann, Johannes, p. 308, fn. 8).

<sup>2</sup>It should be noted that Mary's first words to Jesus (v.32-- κύριε, εἰ ἥς ὥδε οὐκ ἂν μου ἀπέθανεν ὁ ἀδελφός) reiterate those of Martha (v.21-- κύριε, εἰ ἥς ὥδε οὐκ ἂν ἀπέθανεν ὁ ἀδελφός μου). In addition, John has reported that Mary prostrates herself before Jesus (v.32-- ἔπεσεν αὐτοῦ πρὸς τοὺς πόδας). Since the second statement of Martha (v.22) is not spoken by Mary, Bultmann (Johannes, pp. 309f.) concludes that Mary has only reached the first stage of faith. It seems unlikely that John has intended to contrast the faith of Martha with that of Mary (cf. 12:1-8).

It is obvious from the outset of the story that the fourth evangelist has been interested in the illness and subsequent death primarily because of what they will reveal about Jesus. The manner in which he has employed Jesus' initial reaction to the news of Lazarus' illness demonstrates this. In the following verses Jesus acts as the divine Son and declares that the illness of Lazarus will provide the opportunity by which the Son of God will be glorified (v.4).<sup>1</sup> Jesus' delay of two days before he decides to go into Judea (v.6) and his awareness that Lazarus is now dead (vv.11-14),<sup>2</sup> betray divine, not human, sovereignty. That the death of Lazarus is to be the means by which the glory of God

---

<sup>1</sup>Bultmann, Johannes, p. 303, rightly sees that the words of Jesus αὕτη ἡ ἀσθένεια οὐκ ἐστὶν πρὸς θάνατον mean " . . . der Tod ist nicht das Ende und der Sinn der Krankheit."

<sup>2</sup>As John has presented the dialogue in vv.11-14, the disciples understand Jesus' reference to "sleep" literally and fail to perceive the deeper import of his statement. This is one of John's favourite devices (cf. above, p. 404). Cf., however, Bultmann, Johannes, p. 304, who claims that the example in vv.11-14 is not to be attributed to the Johannine "misunderstanding motif" but lay in his source. Barrett, John, pp. 326f., suggests that in the light of the meaning invested in the word κοιμῆσαι by the early Christians John has intended the disciples' words in v.12 (κύριε, εἰ κοιμῶνται σὸ θῆνται) to possess significance. "The disciples, ignorant as they are, may nevertheless unwittingly say what is true (like Caiaphas himself, vv. 50-2)." See also Brown, p. 424.

is revealed is re-emphasized by Jesus when he stands before the tomb (v.40). This manifestation of the Son of God was undoubtedly intended by John to confirm the faith of Martha and Mary and, as v.15 suggests, to deepen that of the disciples (cf. 2:11). John has even indicated that certain of the Jews who had come to console Martha and Mary (v.19) not only are totally absorbed in the pathos of the situation, assuming that one who opened the eyes of the blind man could have kept Lazarus from dying (vv.33-37), but also as witnesses of the miracle believe in Jesus (v.45). The words of Jesus at the tomb make it clear that, for John, the miracle constituted a concrete demonstration that Jesus is sent from God and was intended to bring faith to those who witness it. The Johannine Jesus has no doubt that the Father hears and answers his request, but he addresses the Father at the tomb for the benefit of those present.

Although the raising of Lazarus stands as a sign which both confirms and initiates faith in Jesus, another Johannine theme--in fact, the counterpart to the theme of faith--reaches its climax in this chapter. After Jesus has decided to go to Judea again to raise Lazarus from the dead, his disciples misunderstand the

real intent of Jesus' decision and are principally concerned for his safety since they know that the antagonistic Jews are seeking an opportunity to stone him (v.8; cf. also 10:31,39). John has probably intended the somewhat puzzling answer of Jesus in vv.9f. to be another allusion to the approaching time of darkness, i.e., his Passion and departure from the world.<sup>1</sup> Thomas' declaration to his fellow disciples in the final verse of this scene (v.16) exhibits a certain lack of perception on his part, but, nonetheless, points to the ultimate consequence of Jesus' return to Judea. It is in vv.46-53 that the fourth evangelist has drawn attention to the complete paradox of the situation: Jesus' willingness to grant life hastens his own death since certain of the Jews who witness the raising of Lazarus report this happening to the Pharisees (v.46). This news forces the chief priests and the Pharisees to finalize their plan to kill Jesus.<sup>2</sup> They admit that Jesus does signs, but they are primarily concerned because of

---

<sup>1</sup>See 9:4. Cf. Barrett, John, pp. 325f., and Bultmann, Johannes, p. 304.

<sup>2</sup>Dodd, Interpretation, p. 367, states, "Thus the narrative before us is not only the story of dead Lazarus raised to life; it is also the story of Jesus going to face death in order to conquer death."

the large following which he is attracting and the possible involvement of the Romans (vv.47f.). Caiaphas suggests the obvious solution, and " . . . from that day on they took counsel how to put him to death" (v.53).

The details recounting the actual miracle are scanty: the fact that Lazarus had been in the tomb for four days (vv.17,39) and the presence of the stone establish beyond all doubt that Lazarus is really dead; Jesus' emotional involvement is again stressed (v.38; cf. vv.33ff.);<sup>1</sup> after the removal of the stone, Jesus' prayer to the Father and his cry to Lazarus to come out effect the miracle (vv.41-43); and, finally, the dead man bound in the burial bandages emerges and Jesus instructs them to unbind him and let him go (v.44).

---

<sup>1</sup>The references in v.33 (ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι) and in v.38 (πάλιν ἐμβριμάμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ) have been explained variously--because of Jesus' deep involvement in the emotion of the situation (thus Lightfoot, John, p. 229, and Bernard, vol. 2, pp. 392f.,395); because of the lack of faith on the part of the people and even the two sisters (thus Hoskyns, vol. 2, pp. 472f.; Bultmann, Johannes, pp. 310f.; Dodd, Hist. Tradition, pp. 231f.); because Jesus is being forced to work a miracle (thus Barrett, John, p. 332); because Jesus saw the realm of Satan represented in death (thus Brown, p. 435); and because the miracle worker has to work up his emotions before a difficult act of healing (thus Fuller, Miracles, p. 49). It would appear that the first explanation fits the Johannine context since the πάλιν in v.38 refers to the previous setting in vv.33ff.



Unlike many of the Synoptic miracle stories, this account ends abruptly and reports no reaction of amazement on the part of the witnesses. As we have seen, however, amazement is not an appropriate response to a sign; as vv.45ff. demonstrate it must be either faith or disbelief.

Thus, in conclusion, we have seen that the fourth evangelist has used the story of Lazarus as the final sign of the glorification of the Son of God; Jesus' act of raising Lazarus reveals God's glory but at the same time hastens the time of the Passion--the ultimate hour of his glorification (cf. esp. 11:51f.).

12:1f., 9-11, 17-19--In chapter 12 the fourth evangelist has ingeniously inserted references to the Lazarus incident, underlining further the close connexion between this miracle, in which Jesus restores life, and Jesus' own death.<sup>1</sup> After John has reported that the time of the

---

<sup>1</sup>Brown, pp. 448, 452f., judges this reference to Lazarus (and Martha) to be an editorial attempt to link chapter 12 to chapter 11. Brown (p. XXXVII), of course, considers that chapters 11 and 12 were not included in the first form of the Gospel. Accepting this thesis, the Lazarus motif in 12:9-11 and 12:17-19 are obviously redactional. Although these sections were clearly not part of the traditional material, it is uncertain at which stage in the development of John they were inserted. Cf. Bultmann, *Johannes*, pp. 318f., who assigns 12:9-11 and 12:17f. to the evangelist.

Passover is approaching (11:55) and that the chief priests and the Pharisees have issued a general order in preparation for Jesus' arrest (11:57), he has recounted that Jesus returns to Bethany, the place of his final miracle, where Lazarus himself shares supper with them (12:1f.). Then in 12:9-11 John has introduced a surprising note into the growing drama of the narrative. The crowd comes out to Bethany not only because Jesus is there but also in order to see Lazarus, the living proof of Jesus' Christological claims. It would seem that Lazarus has become a sign which leads the people who see him to believe in Jesus. For this reason the authorities determine that they must also put Lazarus to death. Lazarus is to share the fate of his Lord. Finally, the scene becomes even more tense since it is made clear that it is because of the sign performed in the raising of Lazarus that Jesus is welcomed so enthusiastically at his final entry into Jerusalem. The crowd which had been at the tomb bears witness,<sup>1</sup> and it is for this

---

<sup>1</sup>If in v.17 the reading  $\delta\tau\epsilon$  (p<sup>66</sup> D E\* L al it sy) is accepted rather than  $\delta\tau\iota$  it would mean that the crowd which accompanies Jesus as he enters Jerusalem witnesses to the raising of Lazarus not because they were at the tomb but because they have been convinced by those mentioned in 12:9. Brown, p. 458, suggests that this might help to clarify the presence of the various crowds (vv. 9,12,17,18), but he retains the more difficult reading (thus  $\delta\tau\epsilon$ ).

reason (the sign) that another crowd goes out to meet Jesus (12:17f.). This causes the Pharisees to become all the more suspicious, saying, "You see that you can do nothing; look, the world has gone after him" (12:19).

12:27-30--Jesus, knowing that the hour of his glorification has now come, receives confirmation of this fact through a voice from heaven.<sup>1</sup> Instructive for our study is the answer of Jesus after some in the crowd hear the voice and think that it is thunder while others claim that an angel has spoken to him. As at 11:41f., he asserts that the voice has come for the sake of the bystanders and not for himself. Jesus is divinely aware that the hour of his death has come and with it the hour of judgement and victory over "the ruler of this world" (12:31--ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου), and he is concerned that this be revealed to the people.

12:36b-43--Following Jesus' discussion with the crowd about his forthcoming withdrawal from them (i.e., his Passion), it is reported in 12:36b that he is hiding from them since, as it is implied in 12:37, they do not

---

<sup>1</sup>The words of the divine answer, καὶ ἐδόξασα καὶ ἄλιν δοξάσω (v.28), might imply that the Father has glorified (aorist) Jesus in the signs performed during his ministry and will glorify (future) him finally in the events of the Passion and Resurrection. For another explanation, cf. Brown, pp. 476f.

believe in him in spite of the fact that he has performed many signs in their presence. By introducing the prophetic quotations at this point, John has provided the reason for the people's disbelief; nevertheless, in the very next sentence he has indicated that even many of the authorities believe in Jesus although they are afraid to confess it publicly for the fear of what will happen to them (12:42f.).<sup>1</sup> In other words, John has again stressed that Jesus' signs bring a mixture of responses.

13-17--These five chapters contribute little which is pertinent to our study of the fourth Gospel. References are made to the Devil: in 13:2 it is reported that he (διδάσκαλος) has already put it into the heart of Judas to betray Jesus; in 13:27 it is again stated that Satan (ὁ Σατανᾶς) has entered Judas after Jesus has designated his betrayer; in 14:30 Jesus declares that his time is short since the ruler of this world is coming although Jesus goes on to assert that it is the Father's will, not Satan's power, which controls his destiny; in

---

<sup>1</sup>It is indeed likely that in 12:42 (cf. 9:22) the writer has imported into the story the situation confronting Christians at the turn of the first century--those who confessed Christ were denied entrance to the synagogue.

16:11 it is stated that the coming of the Paraclete will make plain that the ruler of this world is judged; and in 17:15 Jesus prays that the disciples should be kept from the evil one (ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ). In addition, throughout these chapters the Johamine Jesus exhibits his omniscience (cf., e.g., 13:11,19,26). Finally, it is reiterated that Jesus' work on earth was to glorify the Father (17:4); the disciples are urged to believe in Jesus for the sake of these works (14:10f.) and are promised the power to do even greater works than those accomplished by Jesus since he goes to the Father (14:12-14); and the disbelieving ones in the world are said to have no excuse because Jesus has accomplished the works of the Father among them (15:24).

18:4-6--The fourth evangelist has shown that even at the time of his arrest in the garden Jesus, as the divine Son, is in complete command of the situation. He knows all that is going to befall him (18:4), and when he declares the divine Ἐγώ εἰμι in response to the question of his arresters, they are depicted as drawing back and falling to the ground (18:6). In this way John has demonstrated that they are arresting not just an ordinary man but God's Son, whose course is determined by his Father's will (cf. 10:17f. and 18:11b).



19:34f.--In the light of v.35, it would appear that John has intended the incident of the piercing of Jesus' side as a sign, perhaps because of its Eucharistic undertones.<sup>1</sup>

20:30f.--Finally then we note the passage which possibly constituted the conclusion to an earlier form of the fourth Gospel.<sup>2</sup> In 20:30f. the fourth evangelist has indicated that not all the signs done by Jesus have been recounted in this Gospel, but the ones which have been included are intended to bring the readers to faith in Jesus and to the confession that he is the Christ, the Son of God. In other words, real life can come only in the name of this One who manifested the glory of God.

#### Summary: John's Use of the Sign Narratives

As we have seen, it was not possible to confine our investigation to a definite number of miracle stories in the fourth Gospel since in the Johannine presentation the entire earthly ministry of Jesus is a divine epiphany. From the outset of his ministry Jesus acts as

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Cullmann, op. cit., pp. 114-116.

<sup>2</sup>We do not consider the post-Resurrection scene involving the marvellous catch of fish (21:4-8) since chapter 21 has been contributed by the redactor and we cannot, therefore, expect to find in it the Johannine attitude to miracles.

the θεῖος ἀνὴρ who possesses supernatural perception (1:42; 1:47f.; 2:24; 4:16-19; 5:16), foresees the outcome of events before they occur (6:6; 6:64,70f.; 11:4,11-14; 13:38; 18:4), and in particular realizes his own ultimate destiny (2:4; 2:19; 3:14; 12:27f.; 13:1). The farewell discourses (chapters 13-17) strikingly reveal Jesus as the divine Son of the Father who is aware of all things. This feature is emphasized when in 16:30 the disciples respond to Jesus by declaring, "Now we know that you know all things, and need none to question you; by this we believe that you came from God." As the final clause of this verse suggests, the fourth evangelist's portrayal of Jesus as "the divine man" is not essentially patterned after the Hellenistic idea of the θεῖος ἀνὴρ but anchored in the Johannine concept of the unity of the Son with the Father. In other words, the observable supernatural knowledge and power of the Johannine Jesus reside in him not as his own possessions to use and control as he wishes but result from his perfect oneness with God.<sup>1</sup>

The Gospel of John contains only seven pericopae which recount in detail deeds which are miraculously

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Bultmann, Johannes, p. 71, fn. 4.

accomplished by Jesus. As we have seen, three of them are probably different versions of stories which appear in the Synoptic Gospels (4:46-54; 6:1-14; 6:16-21) while those in 5:2-9a, 9:1-7 and 11:1-44 are not dissimilar to certain Synoptic stories--the healing of a paralytic, the restoring of sight to a blind man and the raising of a dead person. Even the transformation of the water into wine at Cana can be compared to the feeding narrative in which the bread and fish are multiplied.

Since John has included only seven miracle accounts, it might be initially concluded that such stories play a less important role in the Fourth Gospel than in the other three Gospels. As we have continually observed, however, this is not the case. Rather, the inclusion of fewer miracle stories is related to the unique function they have in John's Gospel. As it is commonly known, the fourth evangelist has designated Jesus' miracles as *σημεῖα*.<sup>1</sup> Although the word *σημεῖον* also appears in the Synoptic Gospels, it is normally employed in a somewhat different manner. In these

---

<sup>1</sup>For the Greek and Jewish backgrounds of this word, cf. K. Rengstorff, *σημεῖον*, T.W.N.T., vol. 7, pp. 200-227. See also S. V. McCasland, "Signs and Wonders," J.B.L., 76 (1957), pp. 149-152.

Gospels it is occasionally reported that a sign is demanded from Jesus as a legitimatization of his authority for his actions and Messianic claims, and in return Jesus makes it clear that such requests are symptomatic of a disbelieving generation (cf. Mk. 8:11f.; Mt. 12:38f., 16:1-4; Lk. 11:16, 11:29-32). In a few instances in John a similar theme of sign-seeking occurs (2:18; 6:30; 4:48<sup>1</sup>); however, in most passages σημεῖον is used to designate the miraculous deeds done by Jesus.

Elsewhere in the Synoptic Gospels the word σημεῖον is employed in passages describing eschatological events (cf. esp. Mk. 13:4; Lk. 21:7; Mt. 24:3; see also Lk. 21:11,25). In fact, the first evangelist has introduced the word σημεῖον into a passage which describes the Parousia of the Son of man who will come with power and great glory to gather all the elect (Mt. 24:30-- καὶ τότε φανήσεται τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν οὐρανῷ, . . . καὶ ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς). In a sense, the Johannean presentation of Jesus' ministry, together with the reference to his miracles as signs, has a great affinity with the Matthean use of the word "sign" in this

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. above, pp. 410-413.

eschatological picture. By historicizing such a description of the eschatological Son of man, John has been able to portray Jesus already in his earthly ministry as the Son of man invested with power and revealing the glory of God. In this framework Jesus' deeds are the signs which are intended to point to the ultimate truth that he is sent from the Father.<sup>1</sup>

In our study of the sections in John which report the signs of Jesus we have discovered no convincing evidence to cast doubt on the conclusion already accepted above<sup>2</sup> that the fourth evangelist has not directly used one or more of the Synoptic Gospels. It seems likely that he was drawing upon independent tradition, some of which could have been oral. In particular, Bultmann contends that certain definable written sources, including a sign-source, lay behind the present form of the fourth Gospel.<sup>3</sup> The words ταύτην . . . ἀρχὴν τῶν σημείων

---

<sup>1</sup>It must be remembered that the same assertion that Jesus is the revealer of God' will and purpose is made repeatedly in the Synoptic accounts, but the obvious difference exists in the fact that the epiphany motif does not so completely dominate Jesus' entire ministry in those cases.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. above, pp. 395f.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. D. M. Smith, op. cit., pp. 34-44, who conveniently lists those verses and passages in John which Bultmann attributes to the sign-source. In addition,



in 2:11a and the reference to the second sign done in Cana of Galilee in 4:54 together with 20:30f., which would have been an appropriate conclusion to a sign-source, provide the strongest support for Bultmann's contention. Although it seems quite probable that 2:1-11 and 4:46-54 were already linked in the pre-Johannine stage,<sup>1</sup> we find it far more difficult to assign all the miracle sections in John to this one sign-source. For example, Bultmann concludes that 5:2-15, 9:1-38 and 11:2-44 (minus, of course, the redactional insertions of the evangelist) were derived from this postulated written source. We would rather be inclined to think that much more of the narrative material which follows the actual details of the miracles performed by Jesus (thus, e.g., 5:9bff. and 9:8ff.) has resulted from the creative work of the fourth evangelist. It seems probable that John

---

it is worth noting that according to the theory of W. Wilkens (Die Entstehungsgeschichte des vierten Evangeliums, 1958) the original form of the Gospel consisted essentially of the seven narratives recounting the signs. This "Grundschrift" was subsequently twice revised and expanded by the same author (as noted in Smith, ibid., pp. 96f., and Brown, p. XXXII).

<sup>1</sup>These are the only two signs to which John has not appended an extended narrative or discourse section; thus they stand as relatively independent units. Perhaps, John has seen no need to attach explanatory sections since these two pericopae were termed signs. Cf. S. Temple, "The Two Signs in the Fourth Gospel," J.B.L., 81 (1962), pp. 169-174.

has used source material in composing his sign narratives, but it would appear that he has creatively employed it to serve his own purposes. Although it would not be intellectually honest to dismiss outright Bultmann's source theory without considering in detail its many and complicated facets, it can be safely concluded that his reconstruction of the sources behind the fourth Gospel must still be considered to be hypothetical; even granting their existence, it is hazardous to delineate them too precisely.<sup>1</sup>

In this study our principal concern has been to estimate the importance of the signs in the Gospel of John in its present form. As we have seen, unlike the

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. D. M. Smith, op. cit., for a detailed discussion of the various attempts by scholars (e.g., Schweizer, Jeremias, Ruckstuhl, Noack, etc.) to discredit Bultmann's source theory and the noticeable failure of certain other commentators on the fourth Gospel to take seriously the importance of Bultmann's position. From Smith's presentation, it becomes apparent that Bultmann's postulation of a source for the "Offenbarungsreden" has been more severely attacked by his critics than has his claim for a sign-source. Nonetheless, Smith himself (ibid., p. 111, fn. 183) calls attention to a number of features which seem to cast doubt upon the existence of a sign-source as Bultmann has outlined it: e.g., in certain sections considered to be a part of this source there is no mention of a sign (1:35-52; 4:1-42; 5:1ff.; 6:1-26, in which 6:2, 14, 26 are assigned to the work of the evangelist; 7:1-13, in which v.3 speaks of "works" and not signs; 9:1ff., in which the reference to the sign in v.16 is again attributed to the evangelist; and 11:1-44).

Synoptic Gospels, the fourth Gospel reports no exorcisms of demons by Jesus. Although from chapter 13 onwards it becomes clear that in Johannine dualistic terms Jesus' Passion involves a confrontation with Satan and ultimately means that "the ruler of this world" is judged (cf. 16:11),<sup>1</sup> John has not used miracle stories (especially exorcism narratives) to depict the stages in Jesus' struggle and victory over the kingdom of Satan.

It would appear that the fourth evangelist has selected the seven miracle stories with another purpose in mind. As became progressively apparent in our consideration of the Gospel, they have been largely tailored to emphasize the Christological meaning of Jesus' actions. For John the miraculous deeds of Jesus were signs because they pointed to a truth which was far more profound than the observable events would seemingly suggest. The Johannine signs dramatically present who Jesus actually is while at the same time they disclose both the appropriate and inappropriate responses which are elicited by them. They witness simultaneously to the fact that Jesus is sent from God and to the benefits

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. above, pp. 459f.

available to all those who comprehend this truth.<sup>1</sup>

In all seven accounts in which Jesus accomplishes the miraculous he is portrayed as the Son of God who either initiates the action without any apparent request from the beneficiaries of his deeds (cf. esp. 5:6; 6:5,15; 9:6) or alternatively determines his own course of action even in the face of open petitions for his help (cf. 2:3f.; 4:47f.; 11:3-6; see also 7:3-9). Over and above the explicit declarations in John that Jesus' deeds are intended to manifest the glory of God (2:11; 9:3; 11:4,40) the fourth evangelist has employed various techniques to highlight the Christological themes implicit in them. In 5:1ff. and 6:1ff. he has drawn out the real implications of Jesus' action by attaching discourse sections while in 9:1-41 and 11:1-53 he has developed in masterly fashion lengthy narratives in which the reader is quickly led from the brief description of the miracle itself to the fundamental theological issue involved. In 5:1ff. and 9:1ff. the question

---

<sup>1</sup>Throughout this chapter we have used the word "Christological" in a broad sense to designate what is disclosed in the sign narratives concerning who Jesus is and his relationship with the Father. When referring specifically to the benefits of his work for men, it is obvious that, more precisely stated, the Johannine stories also possess soteriological meaning.

of sabbath observance is subsequently introduced into the stories (cf. 5:9b and 9:14) but particularly in the latter instance this theme quickly fades into the background. Unlike certain miracle stories in the Synoptic Gospels, the actual description of the miracle is held to a minimum in the fourth Gospel. In addition, the participants in certain of the Johannine narratives assume a major role in the drama of the scene (cf. esp. 9:1-41); this is different from most Synoptic miracle stories in which those involved are often portrayed in a somewhat stereotyped fashion. Further, it should be noted that, unlike the Synoptic accounts, the occurrences in each sign narrative contribute more directly to the growing drama of the whole Gospel; in other words, in John we do not have, to the same extent as in the Synoptic Gospels, groups of pericopae which are connected by the compositional efforts of the evangelist. Rather, the fourth Gospel appears as a unity in which the signs play a strikingly important part (although it has to be admitted that there exist certain fissures which make some type of source theory necessary). John has repeatedly referred back to a previous incident to add to the drama of a succeeding narrative section (cf., e.g., 7:21; 10:21; 11:37; 12:9-11,17-19), and as a



climax to the growing hostility against Jesus the fourth evangelist has adroitly employed his supreme sign of the raising of Lazarus as the decisive turning point in the Gospel (cf. 11:46-53). From that point onwards the hour of Jesus' final glorification is imminent.

It is thus clear that the fourth evangelist has used these narratives recounting signs not because they emphasize the miraculous aspects of the events but because they possess definite symbolic value.<sup>1</sup> As we have seen, he has used the story of the Cana wedding (2:1-11) to underline the fact that the era of grace has replaced that of the law (cf. 1:17), the healing of the man at the pool (5:1ff.) to disclose the meaning of Jesus' relationship with the Father and the reason for his freedom from the sabbath regulations, the stories of the miraculous feeding and Jesus' appearance on the water (6:1-21) to illustrate that Jesus is the true bread of life come down from heaven, the granting of sight to the blind

---

<sup>1</sup>Fuller, Miracles, pp. 96-109, correctly sees that the fourth evangelist has employed the signs as illustrations of Christological truths, but he exaggerates when he declares that in the pre-Johannine forms of these accounts the miraculous elements were heightened and that they exhibited numerous affinities with pagan wonder stories (cf. esp. pp. 89f.).

man (9:1-41) to demonstrate that Jesus is in fact the light of the world, and the raising of Lazarus (11:1ff.) to verify that Jesus is the resurrection and the life. Although John has probably intended the story of the healing of the nobleman's son (4:46-54) as an example of Jesus' power to grant life (cf. 5:21), the major emphasis in this story is upon the theme of faith.

In spite of Jesus' statement in 7:21, it is obvious that the signs are intended to evoke the reaction of faith, not that of amazement, from those who witness them. As 20:30f. makes quite clear, the signs of Jesus are recounted to disclose that Jesus is sent from God and to lead people to the faith which confesses that he is the Christ, the Son of God (cf. 11:27). It is not incidental to John's plan that the first Cana miracle closes with the assertion that the disciples believe in Jesus as a result of witnessing the manifestation of his glory (2:11). The fourth evangelist has frequently noted that people believe in Jesus or are at least attracted to him on account of the signs (cf. 2:23; 3:2; 6:2,14; 7:31; 11:45; 12:9,17f.; 12:42; see also 8:30). Nevertheless, it often becomes apparent that they do not comprehend the full import of the sign (cf., e.g., 6:26), and it would appear that John has used

4:46-54 (cf. esp. 4:48) as an illustration of the meaning of authentic faith. Christian faith must behold behind the sign the true nature of the One who performs it. In the story of the raising of Lazarus (cf. 11:15,25-27,42) and particularly in the story of the cured blind man (cf. 9:11f.,17,25,31-33,35-37) John has developed the theme of faith. In 9:1-41 the story dramatically unfolds in such a manner that the one who was born blind receives not only physical but also spiritual sight while the Jewish authorities who presume to see become increasingly blind to the truth of Jesus' claims for himself.

As chapter 9 strikingly demonstrates, the signs of Jesus possess a certain enigmatic character.<sup>1</sup> Not all who acknowledge that Jesus does signs come to true faith. In fact, throughout the fourth Gospel there is an increasing emphasis upon the hostility and disbelief which are especially prevalent among the Jewish

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. P. Riga, "Signs of Glory," Interpretation, 17 (1963), pp. 403-410, who attempts to demonstrate the relationship between the Synoptic parables and the Johannine signs. According to Riga, the following pattern is similar: the granting of the sign (or parable), the initial misunderstanding of its real meaning and the further explanation. It should be remembered, however, that the misunderstanding motif in John is not confined to the sign narratives.

authorities (cf. 2:18; 5:16,18; 6:41f.,52,66; 7:1,19, 25,30,32,44; 8:20,48,52,59; 9:16,22; 10:19f.,31,39; 11:46-53,57; 12:10f.,19), and then in a summary comment in 12:37-40 John has indicated that disbelief prevailed among many of the Jews in spite of Jesus' many signs.

While the fourth evangelist has generally designated Jesus' deeds as signs, he has seldom had Jesus himself use this word (only in 4:48 and 6:26). Jesus normally speaks of the "works" which he is doing and thereby interprets all his activity, including the signs. Although the fourth evangelist has generally assigned a wider meaning to *ἔργον/ἔργα* than to *σημεῖον/σημεῖα*, in two instances he has reported that Jesus uses the word *ἔργον* when referring to a specific sign (cf. 7:21 and 9:3f.; see also 7:3). In any case, the words *σημεῖον* and *ἔργον* are intimately interlinked in the Johannine plan.<sup>1</sup> Only those who perceive the real intent of the signs are led to acknowledge that Jesus' sole mission was to do the work of the Father (cf. 4:34 and 17:4). It is important to note that Jesus does not

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. K. Rengstorff, *T.W.N.T.*, vol. 7, pp. 246-249, for his excellent treatment of the Johannine use of these two words. See also E. Haenchen, "'Der Vater, der mich gesandt hat'," *N.T.S.*, 9 (1962-63), pp. 208-216.

designate them as his works since they point to the Father.<sup>1</sup> The works which he accomplishes bear witness to the fact that he is sent from God (cf. 5:36 and 10:25) and are even to be believed for their own sakes since they are the creative activity of the Father (cf. 10:37f. and 14:10-12; see also 6:28f.). Those who recognize Jesus' works for what they are--a revelation of God--are promised that they will be able to do even greater works because Jesus goes to the Father (cf. 14:12)<sup>2</sup> while, on the other hand, those who disbelieve have no excuse since Jesus has accomplished the works of the Father among them (cf. 15:24).

Although John has portrayed Jesus as the Son of God who openly exercises his divine prerogatives in his earthly ministry among men, the Johannine theme initially set forth in 1:9-13 is constantly reiterated throughout the whole of the fourth Gospel. As we have seen, the Johannine signs play a significant role in its development. Those who are led to faith in the light of the signs see Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God, and receive life in his name (cf. 20:30f.); those

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Rengstorff, T.W.N.T., vol. 7, p. 246.

<sup>2</sup>In Johannine thought Jesus' going to the Father is necessary before the Holy Spirit comes (cf. 16:7). Cf. Haenchen, N.T.S., 9 (1962-63), p. 214.



who see the signs and yet reject the reality behind them fail to see the glory of God and remain in darkness. Authentic faith, as John has suggested already in the first sign (2:1-11),<sup>1</sup> is ultimately anchored in the final hour of Jesus' glorification--thus his death and Resurrection.

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. above, pp. 399f. Haenchen, N.T.S., 9 (1962-63), p. 216, states, "Wir hatten vorhin gesagt, dass nach der Überzeugung des Johannes die Liebestat Jesu am Kreuz sich eigentlich über sein ganzes Leben hin erstreckt. Das wird hier nun sehr deutlich sichtbar: schon sein erstes 'Zeichen' in Kana ist ein vorausgeworfener Schatten jener grossen Liebestat am Kreuz."

## CHAPTER V

### THE MIRACLE STORIES IN THE TRADITION PRIOR TO THE WRITTEN GOSPELS

Having considered the evangelists' use of the stories about the miracles of Jesus, it is now necessary to formulate some conclusions regarding the origin and form of these stories in the early tradition. Since we possess no direct evidence from this period but are required to work backwards from the material as it now exists in the written Gospels, no conclusions will be incontestable.

There is one fact, however, which is indisputable. After the death and Resurrection of Jesus certain of his sayings and stories about his deeds circulated orally for some time among the early believers. An established oral tradition, of course, is a phenomenon by no means peculiar to the New Testament age; most peoples living in the ancient world passed on by word of mouth from generation to generation their own peculiar collections of sayings and stories. Indeed, modern-day scholars<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g., Noth, von Rad, Eissfeldt, Eichrodt, and Kuhl.

draw attention to the significant role played by oral tradition in the formation of the Old Testament.

If we can assume that initially the material about Jesus owed its survival to oral transmission, it is then necessary to define more closely the extent of this period and, in particular, the development of the miracle stories in it. First of all we must consider the length of the oral period. Since the Gospel of Mark, which we assume to be the earliest, is usually dated between 65 and 70 A.D.,<sup>1</sup> thirty-five to forty years would be the longest possible length of time during which the material about Jesus could have been transmitted exclusively by word of mouth. But it must be immediately added that it is generally assumed that a considerable portion of the material was collected, and possibly written down, before Mark composed his Gospel. For example, it seems likely that the Passion narrative in written form goes back to

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Taylor, Mark, pp. 31f., who notes the major opinions concerning the date of the composition of Mark. He indicates that it is generally agreed that the second Gospel was written shortly before the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. and declares, "Attempts to date the Gospel earlier are precarious." The most probable alternative date would be just after 70 A.D. Cf. e.g., Branscomb and B. W. Bacon, The Gospel of Mark: Its Composition and Date (New Haven, Conn., 1925). In addition, it is widely accepted that the Gospel was written in Rome. Cf. also R. McL. Wilson, "Mark," Peake's, p. 799, and C. E. B. Cranfield, "Gospel of Mark," I.B.D., vol. 3, pp. 268f.

a relatively early time in the tradition. Also, it is normally held that the non-Markan material common to those Gospels subsequently composed--Matthew and Luke--comes from a source, usually designated as Q, which in all probability must be dated before 70 A.D. Finally, internal evidence seems to suggest that Mark himself had at his disposal certain collections of material, some of which were rather long and reasonably consistent units (e.g., 1:21-39; 2:1-3:6; 6:30-7:37; 8:1-26). Since some of the material about Jesus was being assembled in the early tradition, perhaps for catechetical purposes, it is highly probable that at least some, and possibly a great deal, of it was in written form not so very long after Jesus' crucifixion.

This does not, however, directly answer the vexed question concerning the origins of the miracle stories, nor is it intended in any way to confine the oral period to the initial fifteen or twenty years after the earthly ministry of Jesus. Even if a certain amount of the material about Jesus was in written form at an early date, we cannot conclude on this basis that oral transmission suddenly terminated. For instance, there is definite evidence that the first evangelist, probably writing about 85-90 A.D., has put into writing for the

first time material which he knew from the oral tradition,<sup>1</sup> and it is equally possible that the same process occurred in isolated cases in the composition of the Gospel of Luke.<sup>2</sup> In addition, it has been discovered that a considerable degree of variation, some of which might be attributed to the presence of a lively oral tradition, existed in the material about Jesus well into the second century.<sup>3</sup> For this reason, it appears to be far more realistic to affirm that the words of Jesus and stories about his deeds were handed on during both the first and second centuries by means of a complicated network of sources--some written and some oral--with the different streams in the tradition being modified to some extent by the needs and emphases of the Church in specific geographic locations. If then oral and written sources existed side by side into the second century, we have no guarantee that once a particular story about Jesus was in a written form it would be transmitted unchanged. Oral tradition could cause written sources to

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Kilpatrick, pp. 37-58.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. above, pp. 363f.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. H. Köster, Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern ("Texte und Untersuchungen," Band 65; Berlin, 1957).



be altered just as undoubtedly the written material exercised a stabilizing effect on the oral transmission.

But where does this take us in regard to the miracle stories? Allowing for variations there are basically two explanations put forth by scholars concerning the origins of the Gospel miracle stories. On the one hand, there are those who would assert that the greater part of the Synoptic material,<sup>1</sup> including the miracle stories, is at least based on the report of eyewitnesses. Form critics (e.g., Dibelius and Bultmann), on the other hand, quite categorically assign most of the miracle stories, as well as many other narrative elements, to a later stratum of the tradition.

For the most part, British scholars have espoused the first view.<sup>2</sup> Although they generally allow that the miracle stories were formed in the light of certain apologetic and doctrinal concerns, it is nonetheless maintained that most of these stories rest upon eyewitness reports. Taylor,<sup>3</sup> for example, acknowledges

---

<sup>1</sup>It seems best to consider the material in the fourth Gospel separately. Cf. below, pp. 522-529.

<sup>2</sup>E.g., both Taylor and Cranfield in their commentaries on the Gospel of Mark usually state that the miracle stories exhibit the characteristics of eyewitness accounts.

<sup>3</sup>Formation, pp. 119-141, esp. pp. 122-126.

that these accounts are popular stories but concludes that the presence of detailed description is at least one indication of their primitive nature; in other words, it is a sign of eyewitness reporting. Elsewhere when considering the value of the Papias testimony Taylor comes to the same conclusion:

We may say at once that it is not possible to regard this tradition [Papias] as a full account of the origin of Mark. Had this conclusion been drawn earlier it is probable that the testimony of Papias would have been more widely accepted, for there are many narratives in Mark which by their artless details, vividness, and style suggest derivation ultimately from the words of an eyewitness. . . . I myself should trace something like half the contents of Mark to this personal source, with the proviso that many of the narratives in question are not recorded precisely as they were first related, but reflect in varying degrees the apologetic, liturgical, catechetical, and doctrinal interests of the primitive communities and of Mark himself.<sup>1</sup>

Another British scholar, T. W. Manson,<sup>2</sup> argues in even more detail for the connexion between Peter and Mark

---

<sup>1</sup>"Mark's Use of Gospel Tradition," Bulletin of the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas, No. 3 (1952), p. 30.

<sup>2</sup>"The Foundation of the Synoptic Tradition: The Gospel of Mark" (1944), Studies in the Gospels and Epistles, ed. M. Black (Manchester, 1962), p. 42. F. C. Grant, The Gospels: Their Origin and their Growth (London, 1957), pp. 110-112, interpreting the "Petrine element" somewhat more broadly, lists about fourteen pericopae in Mark--including 1:23-26; 1:29-31; 2:3-9; 4:35-41 (?) [sic]; 5:21-43 (?) [sic]; and 9:14-29--which contain at least a nucleus of Petrine material.

and concludes that the following Markan passages are based upon the testimony of the apostle: 1:16-39; 2:1-14; 3:13-19; 4:35-5:43; 6:7-13,30-56; 8:14-9:48; 10:32-52; 11:1-33; 13:3-4,32-37; 14:17-50,53-54,66-72. It should be noted that, according to Manson, nearly all the miracle story material in Mark<sup>1</sup> has resulted from eyewitness reporting. If this were so, then these narratives would possess great "historical"<sup>2</sup> worth.

In most recent years two Scandinavian scholars, H. Riesenfeld<sup>3</sup> and B. Gerhardsson,<sup>4</sup> have not only argued that most of the Gospel content goes back to Jesus himself but also that this material, in particular the

---

<sup>1</sup>Only Mk. 1:40-45; 3:1-5; 3:7-12; 7:24-30; 7:31-37 and 8:22-26 are not included.

<sup>2</sup>The word "historical" is used throughout this chapter to refer to "things as they actually happened." This usage is in line with the distinction made by J. M. Robinson and J. B. Cobb, Jr. ("New Frontiers in Theology" volumes) between the words "historic" and "historical" to correspond to the German words "geschichtlich" and "historisch" respectively.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. The Gospel Tradition and Its Beginnings: A Study in the Limits of "Formgeschichte" (London, 1961).

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Memory and Manuscript, trans. E. J. Sharpe ("Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis 22"; Uppsala, 1961). [See further Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity, trans. E. J. Sharpe ("Coniectanea Neotestamentica 20"; Lund, 1964), in which Gerhardsson has answered some of his critics.].

sayings of Jesus, was considered "a holy Word," comparable to that of the Old Testament, and was faithfully and quite accurately passed on in a fixed oral form by persons trained in mnemonics and entrusted with this task in the early Church. Gerhardsson, who has taken up this major thesis, attempts to substantiate it in detail by means of a comparison with the practices employed for the transmission of the oral Torah in late Rabbinic Judaism.

If this thesis were to be firmly established as correct, then we not only would be entitled to assign the considerable weight of eyewitness testimony to what we now possess in our Gospels but also we could rest assured that the material prior to the time that it was put into writing was transmitted with the utmost accuracy. This Scandinavian approach to the earliest period of the tradition raises a number of problems, however, and it has been heavily criticized.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. W. D. Davies, "Reflections on a Scandinavian Approach to 'The Gospel Tradition'," Appendix XV to The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount, pp. 464-480, for a fair and adequate treatment of Gerhardsson's book. Cf. further the reviews by C. K. Barrett, J.T.S., 14 (1963), pp. 445-449, and M. Smith, "A Comparison of Early Christian and Early Rabbinic Tradition," J.B.L., 82 (1963), pp. 169-176. See also K. Koch, Was ist Formgeschichte? (Neukirchen, 1964), pp. 96f.



In the light of our concern for the origins of the miracle stories, it is particularly important for us to see that Gerhardsson's argument holds more relevance in regard to the "logia" of Jesus than to the narrative material in the Gospels.<sup>1</sup> In the former case, there is always the possibility that the "ipsissima verba" of Jesus have been remembered and preserved, but in the latter any recounting of his deeds would have been dependent upon someone's interpretation of the events from the very outset.

Near the end of his book Gerhardsson concludes that in addition to the sayings of Jesus the narrative sections also rest firmly on the testimony of ear- and eyewitnesses:

. . . they [the apostles and their disciples] also "remembered" how Jesus acted in various situations; narratives about Jesus' actions were formulated as answers to definite questions. This

---

<sup>1</sup>J. Schneider, "Der Beitrag der Urgemeinde zur Jesusüberlieferung im Lichte der neuesten Forschung," Theologische Literaturzeitung, 87 (1962), p. 408, states in regard to Riesenfeld's approach (the same comment would apply to Gerhardsson's): "Um vollständig zu sein, muss Riesenfeld nun auch die Frage beantworten, ob sich die Anfänge der Überlieferung der Taten Jesu ebenfalls bis zu ihm hin verfolgen lassen. Hier kann Riesenfeld naturgemäss nur sehr unbestimmte Angaben machen und keine befriedigende Antwort im Sinne seiner Grundthese geben. Denn er muss zugestehen, dass die endgültige Gestaltung des Erzählungsstoffes nicht auf Jesus selbst zurückgehen kann, dass vielmehr die Auswahl und Gruppierung desselben, bei der auch Umformungen und spätere Zutaten nicht auszuschliessen sind, bei der Überlieferung eine Rolle spielten."



does not mean that these narratives were mere inventions. The rabbinic comparative material does not favour such a view.<sup>1</sup>

Although Gerhardsson does not directly consider the miracle stories as a specific category of the narrative material, it seems evident that he would claim that they also were remembered and then formulated to emphasize the didactic value of the miraculous activity of Jesus since he elsewhere states, "At all events, the young Church saw all Jesus' works--in fact his whole life--as being teaching."<sup>2</sup> Thus, we are not being unfair if we conclude that for Gerhardsson the miracle stories in the Gospels present a fairly accurate picture of what actually happened in the life of Jesus.

Although many of the British and American scholars who argue that the miracle stories rest upon eyewitness testimony would not be prepared to accept all the conclusions of Gerhardsson, it is clear that in both cases there is extreme confidence in the historical reliability of the Gospel material.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Memory and Manuscript, p. 332.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 328.

<sup>3</sup>It is clear that van der Loos (cf. esp. pp. 136-138) favours this position far more than that of the form critics.

We now turn to the conclusions of the form critics and, in particular, those of Dibelius and Bultmann. As we have already noted, these scholars generally deny that the miracle stories are the results of eyewitness accounts; they assume instead that these stories originated in the later stages of the tradition.

Dibelius believes that the miracle stories, or what he terms "tales" (Novellen), were circulated in the early Church by story-tellers for the purpose of demonstrating that Jesus, as a miracle worker, was the divine manifestation of God. According to him, these miracle accounts possess the features of popular secular stories describing the deeds of the gods or famous thaumaturges and were designed to arouse amazement in all who heard them. For Dibelius, the miracle story " . . . does not begin with a Christological dogma."<sup>1</sup> Unlike the paradigms, therefore, these stories do not contain a particularly reliable picture of the historical Jesus nor were they useful in the early preaching of the Church as illustrative material to reveal God's will for man. Instead, they were convincingly told during the time of the Christian mission to the Hellenized world in order that " . . . the pre-eminence of the 'Lord Jesus' could be

---

<sup>1</sup>p. 97.

demonstrated and all other rival gods who were worshipped driven from the field."<sup>1</sup>

Like Dibelius, Bultmann<sup>2</sup> asserts that the miracle stories reveal little of the actual character of Jesus since they are essentially products of the Church which were intended to verify his Messiahship. To a greater extent than Dibelius,<sup>3</sup> Bultmann points out the specific parallels to features in the Gospel stories from the contemporary Jewish and Hellenistic literature.<sup>4</sup> It is important to note precisely what he states regarding this contemporary material since he is frequently misunderstood at this point:

It is clear that the material cited cannot be reckoned as the source for the miracle stories in the Synoptics, or only in the rarest cases. But it illustrates the atmosphere, shows motifs and forms, and so helps us to understand how miracle stories came into the Synoptic tradition.<sup>5</sup>

It is also pertinent to observe that Bultmann does not consider it to be necessary to draw any real

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 96.

<sup>2</sup>History, pp. 218ff.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Dibelius, pp. 144-151, 164-172.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. esp. P. Fiebig, Jüdische Wundergeschichten des neutestamentlichen Zeitalters (Tübingen, 1911); R. Reitzenstein, Hellenistische Wundererzählungen (Leipzig, 1906); O. Weinreich, Antike Heilungswunder (Giessen, 1909).

<sup>5</sup>History, p. 239.

distinction between the oral and written processes of transmission of the miracle stories since, in his opinion, " . . . the fixing of the tradition in writing was in the first place a quite unliterary process."<sup>1</sup>

According to him, it is far more important to distinguish between the Palestinian and Hellenistic stages of the tradition, and with his attempt to assign the various Gospel miracle stories to one or the other of these periods he has advanced beyond the work of Dibelius. Although Bultmann<sup>2</sup> does grant that some miracle stories emerged in the Palestinian tradition, he assumes that the great bulk of them originated in the Hellenistic Church and were principally designed to set forth Jesus as the "divine man" (θεῖος ἀνὴρ) whose miraculous deeds evoked amazement from all who observed them.

Bultmann,<sup>3</sup> like Dibelius,<sup>4</sup> does not actually deny

---

<sup>1</sup>History, p. 239. Cf. also H. J. Cadbury, "Between Jesus and the Gospels," Harvard Theological Review, 16 (1923), p. 86.

<sup>2</sup>History, p. 240.

<sup>3</sup>Bultmann, Jesus and the Word, trans. L. P. Smith and E. Huntress (London, 1935), p. 173, states, " . . . there can be no doubt that Jesus did the kind of deeds which were miracles to his mind and to the minds of his contemporaries, that is, deeds which were attributed to a supernatural, divine cause; undoubtedly he healed the sick and cast out demons."

<sup>4</sup>P. 94.

that Jesus performed healings of some kind, but he does have serious doubts about the historical value of the miracle stories as recounted in the Gospels. In a few instances he allows that an irrecoverable event might possibly lie behind an existing account, but, for the most part, he supposes that the miracle stories originated quite independently from specific events in the life of Jesus.

Finally, it should be noted that Bultmann<sup>1</sup> rejects the thesis which purports that certain of the Old Testament material was influential in the process of shaping the New Testament stories and instead, like Dibelius,<sup>2</sup> concludes that the majority of them originated in one of the following ways: (a) post-Resurrection stories (epiphany motifs) might have been employed to describe events in the earthly ministry of Jesus; (b) miracle stories might have developed from parables or sayings; and (c) non-Christian popular stories might have been adapted and incorporated into the traditional material.

With these two differing evaluations of the historical worth of the miracle stories before us, we must now attempt to assess the validity of each position. It

---

<sup>1</sup>History, pp. 228-231.

<sup>2</sup>Pp. 97-103.



would appear that many of those who suppose that the weight of eyewitnesses lay behind the present Gospel miracle stories over-simplify the actual situation which existed in the early Church.

In the first place, it seems unlikely that we can claim the authority of eyewitnesses and specifically that of the few men who intimately knew Jesus for all these stories about Jesus. Story-telling was an activity in which most persons of that day gladly participated, and it is highly improbable that in the early Church the original group of apostles attempted to control systematically such an inevitable process. It is indeed likely that in the years immediately following Jesus' death there was little concern to perpetuate a totally reliable tradition about the events in his earthly ministry. It is generally agreed that in those earliest years the Palestinian Church expected the Son of man's immediate return in glory and with it the consummation of God's redemptive purposes in the world.<sup>1</sup> Certain references in Paul's early writings indicate that such a concern regarding Jesus' second coming was even present some years later in Hellenistic Christianity (cf. I Thess. 4:15ff.;

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Fuller, Christology, pp. 142ff.

I Cor. 15:51ff.; Rom. 13:11-14). If then this earliest period in the Palestinian Church was also a time of great eschatological excitement,<sup>1</sup> it does not seem likely that there would have been an overwhelming concern to preserve and pass on in detail the material about Jesus. Most recently A. N. Wilder has supported this view by writing:

We would hold that the earliest days belonged to the Christian prophets and to charismatic visions and oracles bearing, not on the Resurrection of Christ but on his glorification and session at the right hand of God, on the intensification of the present crisis, and the immediate consummation. We have the deposit of such primitive Christian speech in words, visions, oracles, ejaculations, woes, anathemas and doxologies in various parts of the canon. In this short period the role of teacher, scripture-student, eye-witness and even apostle would have been subordinate, except insofar as any of these spoke in these charismatic veins.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>F. J. F. Jackson and K. Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity (5 vols.; London, 1920-33), vol. 1, pp. 301-304, even suggest that such an eschatological hope probably accounts for the presence of the disciples in Jerusalem and not in Galilee (cf. the book of Acts). Paul's comment in Gal. 1:17 implies that the "apostles" were in Jerusalem at the time of his conversion.

<sup>2</sup>"Form-history and the Oldest Tradition," Neotestamentica et Patristica, (Eine Freundesgabe für Oscar Cullmann; "Supplement to Novum Testamentum," vol. 6; Leiden, 1962), p. 7. [Cf. also p. 75 of Early Christian Rhetoric (London, 1964) by the same author.] G. Iber, "Zur Formgeschichte der Evangelien," Theologische Rundschau, 24 (1957-58), p. 328, notes that Dibelius (From Tradition to Gospel, pp. 9f., and Botschaft und Geschichte, vol. 1, pp. 306f.) explains the early Christians' lack of interest in the biographical details of Jesus' life on the basis of their expectation of the end

Secondly, we have no guarantee that the stories about the deeds of Jesus, particularly as they were circulated in the later stages of the tradition, were handed on faithfully. Rather, it is probable that the opposite occurred. The early stories which had come out of the Palestinian tradition could have easily acquired new features in the process of retelling while at the same time it is also possible that certain details could have been omitted. Since this probably happened, the graphic details of a miracle story in its present form are not necessarily traceable to the report of an eye-witness; they could be the results of numerous retellings. In fact, it cannot be ruled out that whole stories could have been related in the later stages of the tradition on the basis of either debatable evidence or merely a generalized recollection that Jesus worked miracles. That this happened in certain instances seems even more probable if,

---

times. Further, he calls attention to the argument of Donlon, who attempts to show, in opposition to Dibelius' view, that in spite of his eschatological hopes Paul was concerned about the reconversion of the Jews (Rom. 9-11) and the practical matters in Corinth and that, therefore, the early Christians would have been able to preserve a more exact presentation of the events in the life of Jesus. In answer to Donlon, Iber claims that he misunderstands Dibelius' argument since Dibelius was asserting why the early Christians expressed no interest in the historical details and not stating that they were incapable of reconstructing them.

as apparently was the case,<sup>1</sup> the Gentile mission of the Church was largely carried out by men who had not known the earthly Jesus. Whatever details they knew about the events in Jesus' ministry they must have received either from their contacts with the Palestinian Church or from stories already circulating in Hellenistic Christianity. If they had gained their knowledge of the historical Jesus from the latter source, there is, of course, no guarantee that all, or even any, of this material was based upon eyewitness testimony.

The almost complete lack of allusions to the episodes in the life of Jesus in the writings of Paul has long been an enigma for New Testament scholars. Did Paul know the stories about Jesus and choose not to use them, or was he almost entirely ignorant of Jesus'

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. the book of Acts and the Pauline epistles. Allowing that the book of Acts might have been theologically conditioned, it is nevertheless noteworthy that the first apostles are therein reported to be in the mother church up until the time of the Jerusalem council, which in the light of the reference by Paul in Gal. 2:1 and the chronology of the book of Acts itself is probably to be dated between 44 and 48 A.D. (Cf. Jackson and Lake, op. cit., vol. 4, p. 86, and Haenchen, Apg., pp. 57f.). It is possible that Peter for one travelled outside Palestine and Syria after 50 A.D. since the Corinthian correspondence indicates that Peter had a certain following in Corinth (cf. I Cor. 1:13). Indeed, Peter might have even journeyed as far as Rome (cf. T. W. Manson, op. cit., pp. 39f.).



sayings and the stories about his deeds, many of which were subsequently incorporated into the Synoptic Gospels? Gerhardsson,<sup>1</sup> in support of the first alternative, assumes that Paul had received the tradition about Jesus from those in Jerusalem, but in doing so the Scandinavian scholar almost entirely puts forward an argument from silence. He refers to Paul's fortnight visit with Peter in Jerusalem, mentioned in Gal. 1:18-20, and concludes that Peter must have surely shared with Paul some information about the historical Jesus.<sup>2</sup> Further, Gerhardsson bases his case upon Paul's reference in I Cor. 15:3ff. to that which he had "received" (παρέδωκα γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν πρώτοις, ὃ καὶ παρέλαβον), but it should be noted that what the apostle goes on to report in this passage is concerned with only the death, Resurrection and post-Resurrection appearances of Christ.

Although at this point we cannot arrive at any positive solution to the question regarding Paul's knowledge of the historical Jesus, it seems clear that the absence

---

<sup>1</sup>Memory and Manuscript, pp. 296-300.

<sup>2</sup>As support for his conclusion, Gerhardsson cites the comment of Dodd [The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments (London, 1936, this ed.--1963), p. 16] about this contact between Peter and Paul: "At that time he stayed with Peter for a fortnight, and we may presume they did not spend all the time talking about the weather."



of direct references to the sayings and deeds of Jesus in the Pauline epistles renders no support to the assumption that material about Jesus based upon eye-witness reporting was abundant throughout the whole Church at a relatively early date. Even if Paul were acquainted with stories about Jesus, there is no guarantee that these stories reflected a reliable tradition.<sup>1</sup>

On the other hand, it would seem that both Dibelius and Bultmann conclude rather arbitrarily that most of the miracle stories originated outside the Palestinian milieu. As we have seen, Dibelius assumes that the early Church's preaching<sup>2</sup> was implemented by "paradigms." Although he includes among them certain pericopae which report miracles of Jesus (Mk. 2:1ff., 3:1ff., 1:23ff., 10:46ff.;

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. D. Georgi, Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1964). If Georgi's thesis is correct, it is likely that Paul would have been acquainted with stories about Jesus which possessed an epiphany Christology (similar to that of certain of the miracle stories appearing in Mark). According to Georgi, there is evidence for supposing that in II Cor. (cf. esp. 11:4) Paul was intent upon repudiating a conception of the earthly Jesus as expounded by certain men in the Church who presented him in terms of the Hellenistic θεός ἀνθρώπου.

<sup>2</sup>It should be remembered that for Dibelius "preaching" refers to all the various forms of the Church's proclamation both within the community and in its mission.

Lk. 14:1ff.),<sup>1</sup> he supposes that the other miracle stories have resulted from a development altogether different from that of the paradigms. These stories reflect a later stage in the tradition when persons skilled in story-telling began to play a prominent role.<sup>2</sup>

It is obvious that Dibelius has employed a definite criterion when assessing the historical value of any one Gospel story. According to him, the less an account resembles the secular stories of that day, the greater the possibility that it goes back to the earliest stage of the tradition.<sup>3</sup> Although thus stated this rule is valid,

---

<sup>1</sup>Dibelius (p. 43) designates the last three of these stories as paradigms of "a less pure type."

<sup>2</sup>E. Fascher, Die formgeschichtliche Methode ("Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, No. 2"; Giessen, 1924), pp. 70-78, argues that the differences in style between the paradigms and the tales are largely due to the kind of material being recounted and not a difference in "Sitz-im-Leben." For this reason, he concludes that Dibelius is not justified in postulating that a group of story-tellers was active in the early Church.

<sup>3</sup>G. Iber, op. cit., pp. 325f., quotes Dibelius from the first volume of Botschaft und Geschichte (This volume was not accessible to me.): "Je weniger sich eine Geschichte der Art und Technik der üblichen umlaufenden Erzählungen jener Zeit nähert, um so sicherer ist die Annahme, dass sie in den Kreisen der ersten Gemeinde entstanden ist; entsprechend grösser ist ihr historischer Wert. Denn diese Kreise waren mit den ersten Missionaren verbunden und durch sie mit den Augenzeugen des Lebens Jesu. In jenen Kreisen war darum ein völlig irrtümliches Bild vom Wirken Jesu unmöglich."

it is not to be precluded that Gospel narratives which now exhibit the features of popular stories were circulated in the earliest tradition. In other words, Dibelius is not justified in assigning a story as a whole to a later stage of the tradition merely on the basis of its present form since certain features could have been added or changed in the process of transmission.

In addition, it seems debatable to presume that all the miracle stories, save those which Dibelius has classified as paradigms, have been equally influenced by a Hellenistic epiphany Christology. By including the story of the healing of Bartimaeus (Mk. 10:46ff.) among the paradigms, it would appear that Dibelius has in at least one case decided that this motif was not prominent in a miracle story. It would seem necessary, therefore, to distinguish more carefully between those features in the miracle stories which reflect the θεός ἀνὴρ Christology and those which have apparently resulted from an earlier Christological conception.

As we have already noted, Bultmann<sup>1</sup> does differentiate between the Palestinian and the Hellenistic stages of the tradition and, like Dibelius, thinks that the

---

<sup>1</sup>History, pp. 239f.

pericopae which he terms apophthegms--those containing sayings of Jesus--probably originated in the earliest period. Among them he lists the healing of the man with a withered hand (Mk. 3:1-6), the healing of the paralytic (Mk. 2:1-12), and the casting out of demons followed by the Beelzebub controversy (Mt. 12:22ff./Lk. 11:14ff.; cf. Mk. 3:22-30). Although both the sabbath healing of the man with dropsy (Lk. 14:1-6) and the healing of the crippled woman (Lk. 13:10-17) are included by Bultmann among the apophthegms, he suggests that these stories could have been fashioned in the Hellenistic Church on the basis of Mk. 3:1-6. In addition, he does grant that the story of the healing of the centurion's servant (Mt. 8:5-13/Lk. 7:1-10) and that of the Syrophoenician woman (Mk. 7:24-30) arose in the Palestinian period although this latter one could have been developed in Hellenistic Christianity as a variant to the former. Even beyond this he allows that the following miracle stories go back to the Palestinian community: the healing of the leper (Mk. 1:40-45), the stilling of the storm (Mk. 4:35-41), and at least one of the feeding narratives (Mk. 6:34-44; 8:1-9).

Bultmann, however, thinks that most of the miracle stories which are unattached to apophthegms can be

assigned to the Palestinian period with far less certainty since there are remarkably few examples of contemporary miracle stories in Rabbinic Judaism. Since the Hellenistic world supplies us with a larger body of literature evidencing an interest in the miraculous, Bultmann<sup>1</sup> concludes that it was in the later stages that the majority of the miracle story material was incorporated into the tradition about Jesus.

It would appear that Bultmann has been too markedly influenced by the Hellenistic parallels. It is now being recognized that " . . . most of the evidence adduced for the Hellenistic concept of the divine man by the History of Religions school is later than the New Testament."<sup>2</sup> Further, it must be remembered that evidence for an interest in the miraculous is not completely absent in the Jewish sources of the first few centuries<sup>3</sup> and that Bultmann<sup>4</sup> himself assigns certain of the Gospel miracle

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid...

<sup>2</sup>Fuller, Christology, p. 98.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Fiebig, op. cit. Cf. L. J. McGinley, Form-Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives: A Study in the Theories of Martin Dibelius and Rudolf Bultmann (Woodstock, Maryland, 1944), pp. 96-152, for a detailed consideration and comparison of the Rabbinic and Hellenistic miracle material. It is worth noting that in the Rabbinic stories little attention is given to the cure of various illnesses and disorders while exorcisms are often recounted. The opposite emphasis is evidenced in the Hellenistic sources.

<sup>4</sup>History, p. 240.



stories (Mk. 4:35-41 and Mk. 6:34-44 or 8:1-9) to the Palestinian stage on the basis of the Jewish parallels. Finally, as Bultmann<sup>1</sup> acknowledges, the Rabbinic sources in which the primary concern is with the exposition of the law do not reveal the extent of the telling of miracle stories among the common people in Palestine. Re-counting stories about the miraculous feats of their religious heroes would not have seemed unusual to the Jewish people since they had a heritage of such stories in the Old Testament.<sup>2</sup> The inclination towards such popular story-telling could have been furthered by whatever Hellenistic influences penetrated the Palestinian borders prior to the first century A.D. All this coupled with the lively expectation on the part of the Jews that in the Messianic Age there would be a restoration of all things lost through the fall of Adam, thus the vanquishing of all sickness and death,<sup>3</sup> would have provided the natural soil for the growth of stories about Jesus' healings and exorcisms.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 239f.

<sup>2</sup>See B. Lindars, "Elijah, Elisha and the Gospel Miracles," Miracles, ed. C. F. D. Moule, pp. 63-79.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Strack-Billerbeck, vol. 1, pp. 593-596. Various Isaianic passages (including Is. 35:5f.) figured prominently as a basis for this Messianic hope, although they were frequently interpreted in a spiritual sense.

If then, as both Dibelius and Bultmann admit,<sup>1</sup> Jesus did effect healings and cast out demons, it seems reasonable to assume that stories about these deeds were present in the tradition from the earliest time.<sup>2</sup> It is even likely that some were related already during Jesus' lifetime. In some instances, these stories would have been based upon quite specific memories of events in Jesus' ministry while, on other occasions, they would have been formulated only on the basis of a generalized recollection of Jesus' healing ministry.<sup>3</sup>

Contrary to Bultmann,<sup>4</sup> it seems likely that the first Jewish Christians would have quite naturally told stories about the deeds of Jesus in the terms of the categories of the Old Testament. It has been fairly well established that the Christology of the earliest tradition interpreted

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. above, pp. 489f.

<sup>2</sup>E. Trocmé, La formation de l'évangile selon Marc (Paris, 1963), pp. 40-43, contends that the Markan miracle stories circulated as popular accounts about Jesus' deeds in Galilee and were quite distinct from the official tradition of the Church in Jerusalem. These stories, according to Trocmé, were directly incorporated into the original Palestinian Gospel (Mk. 1-13), which only subsequently (in Rome) was expanded into the present canonical Gospel. This thesis is not really convincing.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Fuller, Miracles, pp. 18ff.

<sup>4</sup>History, pp. 229f.

the earthly ministry of Jesus in the terms of a Mosaic servant-prophet figure.<sup>1</sup> As we shall see, certain of the miracle stories even in their present form mirror such a Christological conception. Therefore, rather than too quickly assuming with Dibelius and Bultmann that extraneous stories have been transferred to Jesus, it seems better to conclude that most of the Gospel miracle stories were at one time circulated in the Palestinian Church but that many of them have been altered in the later stages of transmission so that the earlier Christological conception is not easily recognizable.

On the basis of his investigation of the Christological development evidenced in the New Testament documents, Fuller declares,

Bultmann's contention (Tradition, p. 240) that the miracle stories proper (as opposed to the apophthegms) were created in this milieu [that is, the "Hellenistic Gentile mission"], is already disproved by the prophet-servant (i.e. early Palestinian) Christology which characterizes the primary stratum of these stories, and by the Son of God Christology (in the modified Hellenistic Jewish sense) which qualifies the second stratum. But that they were modified in this milieu is plausible.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Fuller, Christology, pp. 167-173, and J. Jeremias, Μωυσῆς, T.W.N.T., vol. 4, p. 873.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 240.

Before we complete this discussion, it is necessary to consider each story individually, determining wherever possible its form and use in the earliest tradition. In doing this we shall attempt, like Fuller (who follows Hahn), to take into account not two but three stages in the tradition--the Palestinian, the Hellenistic Jewish mission and the Hellenistic Gentile mission.

In our attempt to determine the forms of the miracle stories which are earlier than those in the written Gospels,<sup>1</sup> a number of points must be kept in mind. In the first place, it would be wrong to have in mind a stereotyped pattern for the miracle story and then to assess all variations to it as later additions.<sup>2</sup> It is possible that certain edifying themes (e.g., the theme of discipleship) were integral parts of the original accounts and were based upon reliable tradition. Secondly, as we have seen, after being put into written form the miracle stories were abbreviated at some points and

---

<sup>1</sup>It must be admitted that in most cases it is probably impossible to reconstruct the original form of the story.

<sup>2</sup>Fascher, op. cit., pp. 121-126, considers the mechanical manner in which Bultmann interprets the faith motif and the references to the miracle-working power of Jesus. He concludes that Bultmann is open to the danger of subjecting all the details of the stories to rigidly predetermined conclusions.

expanded in other places during their transmission. It seems likely, therefore, that during the oral tradition various details were similarly embellished or deleted depending upon the interest and/or the memory capacity of the person relating the story. For this reason, it is not possible to determine the primitive nature of a story merely on the basis of the number of details it contains. It depends much more on what the details are and whether they reflect an early or late stage of theological formulation. Consequently, in attempting to assign a story to a specific stage of the tradition it is extremely helpful when a Christological statement appears in the account. Finally, it must be remembered that we are only endeavouring to indicate what the early forms of the stories might have been and are not trying to reconstruct the historical events which prompted them.

First of all, we list those stories which probably circulated in the Palestinian community. Certain of them exhibit few signs of having been altered in the later stages of the tradition while others do show such characteristics. Generally, these stories are in line with the prophet-servant Christology of the earliest Church.

It seems quite certain that some form of Mk. 6:35-44 goes back to the Palestinian period, v.41 having been



shaped with a view to the Eucharist. The prophet-servant Christology definitely lay behind this narrative.<sup>1</sup> This is seen in the reference to the wilderness (6:35) which would have reminded the Jewish Christians of Moses and the feeding of manna in Exod. 16. In addition, the fact that all the people are satisfied in spite of the meagre provisions would have possibly suggested the feeding at the hand of the prophet Elisha as recounted in II Ki. 4:42-44. Originally, this feeding narrative might have been told to draw attention to Jesus as the eschatological prophet who shares the promised Messianic meal with his people.

As the contemporary parallel literature demonstrates,<sup>2</sup> stories about Jesus' exorcisms would have been more readily told in a Jewish environment than in the Hellenistic world. It seems certain that some form of Mk. 1:23-27 was related in the Palestinian Church.<sup>3</sup> Not only are the demon's words of address in v.24, "the Holy One of God," probably an early Christological title (Palestinian

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Hahn, pp. 391f., and Fuller, Christology, p. 171.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. above, p. 500, fn. 3.

<sup>3</sup>It is interesting to note that Dibelius (p. 43) lists this account among the paradigms.

stage), but combined with the words  $\tau\acute{\iota} \eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu \kappa\alpha\iota \sigma\omicron\iota$  they suggest an Old Testament background (see I Ki. 17:18-- $\tau\acute{\iota} \acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\iota \kappa\alpha\iota \sigma\omicron\iota, \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\epsilon \tau\omicron\upsilon \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ ).<sup>1</sup> 1:23-27a (including  $\kappa\alpha\iota \acute{\epsilon}\theta\alpha\mu\beta\acute{\eta}\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu \acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ ) was possibly an early form of the story with vv. 21f, v. 27b and v. 28 being appended at later times. Although this pericope would have been interpreted in the later stages of the tradition in the light of the Hellenistic  $\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu\eta\rho$ , it would appear that this story was first told to emphasize that Jesus was seen in the terms of the Old Testament as a holy man of God who exercised authority over the evil spirits.

It seems probable that the other exorcism stories go back to the earliest stage of the tradition even though, like Mk. 1:23-27a, they were probably employed in the Hellenistic communities as illustrations of Jesus as the  $\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu\eta\rho$ .

Mk. 5:1-20 is sometimes judged to be a popular tale first told about a Jewish exorcist which was transferred to Jesus.<sup>2</sup> In spite of this opinion, there appears to be no reason to deny that a simpler form of this story about Jesus goes back to the Palestinian period.

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Hahn, pp. 235ff., 295f.

<sup>2</sup>Thus Dibelius, pp. 100f.

Undoubtedly, portions of vv.1,2<sup>1</sup> were added when this story was joined to 4:35-41, and it is possible that vv.18-20 were not originally part of the account. Although it is impossible to determine at which stage the reference to the herd of swine first became a feature of the narrative, the story's lack of concern over the fate of the swine reflects a Jewish attitude. Further, it is important to note that the Jewish idiom *τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί* (v.7) appears again, and it seems likely that in the earliest tradition this story resembled Mk. 1:23ff. It has been concluded<sup>2</sup> that in this instance the application of the "Son of God" title to Jesus gives evidence that this pericope was adapted in the Hellenistic Jewish community.

Mk. 9:14-29 has possibly resulted from the merger of two stories (cf., e.g., v.15 and v.25; v.18a and v.22a; v.20 and v.26a),<sup>3</sup> but, if so, it is not now possible to sort out satisfactorily the two accounts. Vv.28f. were certainly not part of the earlier narrative

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. v.6, in which the approach of the demoniac is described a second time.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Hahn, pp. 296f. (followed by Fuller, Christology, p. 194).

<sup>3</sup>Cf. above, p. 106.

and were probably added by Mark. Although it is possible that a story focusing upon the theme of doubting faith (vv.21-27) was supplemented in a later stage of the tradition by another which contrasted "the apprentices and the master wonder-worker" (vv.14ff.),<sup>1</sup> it is likely that at least part of this pericope circulated in the Palestinian period as an example of Jesus' authority over the spirits.

The simple report of Jesus' exorcism in Mt. 12:22,23a/Lk. 11:14 was probably included in Q as a preparation for the Beelzebub controversy. This account was seemingly based on a generalized memory of Jesus' casting out of evil spirits; nonetheless, it could have been told in the Palestinian tradition.

Since a concern with the Mosaic law would have been most pressing in the Palestinian community, there is no reason to deny a place to Mk. 1:40-44 in this earliest period of the tradition. It seems likely that a portion or the whole of v.45 was not originally connected to this pericope.<sup>2</sup> It is impossible to discover, however, at which stage the reference to the anger of Jesus (v.41)<sup>3</sup> was introduced just as we cannot be certain of the

---

<sup>1</sup>Thus Fuller, Miracles, p. 34.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. above, p. 24.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. above, pp. 23f.

original intention of the words in v.43. These features would have been fitting if in the earliest tradition Jesus' action of healing the leper was seen as an exorcism. In any case, 1:40-44 was probably first recounted to emphasize Jesus' compliance with the law and at the same time his superiority over it. Jesus overcomes the dreaded disease of leprosy which could only be regulated by the Mosaic law.

Although it is impossible to determine the original form of Mk. 4:35-41,<sup>1</sup> a definite Jewish colouring is recognizable.<sup>2</sup> This story was probably first intended as an example of Jesus' authority over the demonic spirits present in this world of chaos (v.39). In the light of the Old Testament testimony<sup>3</sup> the theological conception implicit in this story would not have been incompatible with the Christology of the Palestinian Church. It is likely, however, that 4:35-41 would have been

---

<sup>1</sup>C. H. Dodd, Studies in the Gospels, ed. D. E. Nineham, p. 26, concludes that Mk. 4:35-41 does not possess the features of the post-Resurrection stories.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Fiebig, op. cit., pp. 61f., where he reports a Rabbinic story (about 350 A.D.) intended to demonstrate the superiority of Yahweh over the pagan gods (because he answered the call of the Jewish lad during the storm). See also Fiebig, p. 33.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. above, pp. 38f.



interpreted in the light of the θεῖος ἀνὴρ Christology in the Hellenistic stages of the tradition. Although there is no reason to assume that the theme of discipleship was unimportant to the earlier form of the story,<sup>1</sup> it is evident that the chorus ending in v.41b has been added during its transmission for the purpose of drawing attention to the question of Jesus' identity.

Similarly, there are no features in Mk. 1:29b-31 which run counter to the prophet-servant Christology of the Palestinian period. In fact, 1:29b-31 is so brief and straightforward that it seems certain that it was recounted in the earliest period of the Church on the basis of a quite specific memory of a time when Jesus helped the apostle's ill relative. V.29a was added when the story was joined to the preceding one (probably in the written stage), but whether or not the names of Andrew, James and John (v.29) were originally included in the narrative is impossible to adduce. In addition, 1:32-34a was probably first appended to this story in

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. G. Schille, "Die Seesturmerzählung Markus 4:35-41 als Beispiel neutestamentlicher Aktualisierung," Z.N.W., 56 (1965), pp. 30-40. Presupposing that the stereotyped form of a miracle story lay behind 4:35-41, Schille too quickly regards the theme of discipleship as a subsequent interpretation by Mark of what was formerly a general miracle story.

the pre-Markan written stage of the tradition, with v.34b being Markan.

Eliminating v.46a and v.52b, which were added to link Mk. 10:46-52 to its Markan context, we are still left with an account which undoubtedly goes back to the Palestinian community and possibly in the light of the name "Bartimaeus" was based upon a specific memory. It was probably during the Hellenistic Jewish mission that the "Son of David" title was introduced into the account;<sup>1</sup> prior to that time it is more than likely that only the designation "rabbi" appeared (cf. v.51). From the earliest time this story was probably recounted as a significant example of faith. Here again, especially since little attention is given to the miracle done by Jesus, there is nothing which is incompatible with the Christology of the Palestinian Church.

Certain other pericopae in which the healing itself does not receive the major stress probably originated in the Palestinian Church. One such story is Mk. 2:1-12, in which Jesus' right to forgive sins on earth is established. The Palestinian origin of the saying in 2:10 is apparent as the "Son of man" title

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. above, pp. 116f.

was a characteristic feature of the Christology of the earliest Church.<sup>1</sup> Although this logion might have circulated independently for a time, it seems likely that vv.6-10 were combined with the miracle story (vv.3-5 and 11f. minus the introductory σοὶ λέγω) in the earliest period of the Christians' debate with Judaism over their right to forgive sins. If v.5b was part of the story of healing, it is readily understandable why vv.6-10 would have been inserted.<sup>2</sup> Vv.1f. were probably formed when this story was introduced into the larger literary complex and then later either altered or supplemented by Mark.<sup>3</sup>

Although Mk. 3:1-5 could have come into being in the Hellenistic Jewish stage of the tradition since the Church would have then been concerned about the observance of the sabbath, it could have just as readily arisen in the Palestinian Church. It is quite possible that both Mk. 2:23-27 and Mk. 3:1-5 were linked by means of the Son of man logion in 2:28 in the earliest tradition. This saying was probably constructed by the Palestinian Church on the basis of an authentic word of Jesus

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Fuller, Christology, pp. 143-151.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Hahn, p. 42. Also see above, pp. 25f.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. above, pp. 26f.

to justify its claim to exemption from the numerous sabbath regulations.<sup>1</sup> As we have seen,<sup>2</sup> v.6 was probably added when the conflict stories in 2:1-3:5 were collected. Besides this, little can be said about the formation of 3:1-5 unless, perhaps, the words of Jesus in v.4a were at one time circulating independently. Since, however, they are in the form of a question, this does not seem likely.

The story of the centurion (Mt. 8:5-13/Lk. 7:1-10) was apparently included in the Q material, and this source is normally thought to be of Palestinian origin.<sup>3</sup> Because of the divergence of the Matthean and Lukan introductory sections, it is possible that little more than the middle portion (Mt. 8:8-10/Lk. 7:6b-9) composed the earliest narrative. In this abbreviated form the story would have not only emphasized the faith of the Gentile but also the authority of a word of command. Such a stress upon the effect of the word of authority would have corresponded to the import of the "word" in the Old Testament prophetic tradition. Consequently,

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Fuller, Christology, pp. 149f.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. above, pp. 32-34.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. W. G. Kümmel, op. cit., pp. 55-58.

this story would have been appropriate to the Christological viewpoint of the Palestinian Church.

Mk. 7:24-30 resembles the story of the centurion<sup>1</sup> and was first circulated in a Jewish sector of the Church since it relates a case of demon possession (v.30). Although most of v.24 was not originally part of the account, it appears that vv.27f. would have been essential to this story in the earliest times. In the light of its concern with the Gentiles' portion in the Kingdom, this story originated in either the Palestinian or the Hellenistic Jewish stage of the tradition.

It is impossible to know whether Mk. 5:22-24a,35-43 was initially recounted as an instance of Jesus' raising a dead person or was only subsequently altered to that from a story of a healing. If this pericope were at one time independent from the narrative about the woman with the flow of blood, then it is probable that the central portion (vv.35f.) would have read somewhat differently. In addition, v.21 was presumably not part of the early form of the story while v.43a was probably added by Mark. Certain other details were possibly included in the process of retelling. Although the occurrence of the Aramaic

---

<sup>1</sup>It is by no means apparent that these two stories are variants as Bultmann (History, p. 38) thinks.



words in v.41 does not guarantee the Palestinian origin of the story,<sup>1</sup> it is not to be precluded that in some form it circulated in the earliest tradition. If this story originally reported a healing done by Jesus, there is no reason for not assigning it to the Palestinian milieu. Even if from the start it were told as an account of a resuscitation, it could go back to the earliest community since, unlike Jn. 11, it exhibits no signs of an advanced stage in theological reflection.<sup>2</sup>

Although some form of Mk. 5:25-34 could go back to the Palestinian period since the story exhibits no obvious signs of theological development, it seems likely that it has taken on certain marginal features in the Hellenistic Gentile phase of the tradition (cf. esp. v.30).<sup>3</sup> Whether or not v.34 was part of the earlier story must remain undecided, but, in any case, at an earlier stage the story probably circulated as a separate unit.<sup>4</sup>

It seems probable that in Mk. 11:13f., 20f. we have a miracle story which developed from a parable or an

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Bultmann, History, p. 222.

<sup>2</sup>It is perhaps noteworthy that in this story only the title διδάσκαλος is applied to Jesus (cf. v.35).

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Hahn, pp. 312f.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. above, p. 50.

anecdote,<sup>1</sup> but it is not at all obvious at what point in the tradition this occurred. Such a process could have actually taken place already in the Palestinian period since the episode has a recognizable Old Testament background and the title of address used in v.21 is "rabbi." In their present form, v.12, vv.20-25 and possibly the words ὁ γὰρ καί ποτε οὐκ ἦν σὺ χων (v.13) are to be considered as secondary to the original story. As is the case in its Markan context, this story was probably first told to emphasize the theme of God's judgement upon Israel and not primarily to highlight the miraculous power of Jesus.

Having noted those stories which in some form probably originated in the Palestinian community, we now enumerate the accounts which appear to have come into being as variants to earlier stories.

For example, it has been suggested that in Mk. 6:45-51 a version of the stilling of the storm was overlaid with an epiphany motif.<sup>2</sup> Such a process presupposes a later stage in the tradition since the epiphany Christology was not particularly characteristic of the

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. above, pp. 121f.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. above, p. 67. See also C. H. Dodd, Studies in the Gospels, ed. D. E. Nineham, pp. 23f.

earliest Church. The story was intended to demonstrate that Jesus as the divine Son was not hindered by the normal limitations to which all men are subject but could miraculously rescue the disciples when they were in a situation which was impossible from a human standpoint.

As we have seen,<sup>1</sup> Mk. 8:1-9 was probably another version of the feeding narrative which developed in a Hellenistic stage of the tradition.

It is perhaps at this point that we should consider certain of the special Lukan stories. Although they might have been based upon reliable tradition, it is probable that they were recounted in the later stages of the tradition on the pattern of earlier stories.

For example, even if the story of healing briefly related in Lk. 13:11-13 goes back to the early tradition, it seems likely that the discussion regarding the observance of the sabbath was appended at a later date, probably in the Hellenistic Jewish sector of the Church in view of the reference to "a daughter of Abraham" (v.16).<sup>2</sup> Certain features of the present pericope are

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. above, pp. 60,87-91.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Haenchen, Der Weg, p. 128.

undoubtedly due to Lukan redaction.<sup>1</sup>

Since Lk. 14:1-6 exhibits a great deal of Lukan vocabulary,<sup>2</sup> it is possible that the third evangelist has composed this story on the basis of oral tradition. In any case, the story is not necessarily based on a specific event but simply a generalized memory of Jesus' conflict with his opponents about the sabbath. It might have been patterned after Mk. 3:1-5.

It is possible that Lk. 17:11-19 is a story which arose in the Samaritan territory, possibly related in some way to Mk. 1:40-44, although it could go back to an early Jerusalem tradition.<sup>3</sup> It is even possible that the Old Testament story of the healing of Naaman (II Ki. 5:8ff.) was influential in giving form to this account.

In addition, two Matthean pericopae must be mentioned here. Although Mt. 9:27-31 probably contains certain traditional elements, this story as well as that in Mt. 9:32-34 has undoubtedly resulted from Matthew's redactional work.

Finally, it would appear that certain accounts exhibit few, if any, indications that they go back to the

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. above, p. 358.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. above, pp. 363f.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. above, p. 369.

earliest stratum of the tradition. These stories were first told in the later stages of the tradition or were earlier accounts largely reworked in the retelling process.

For example, we cannot be certain that Mk. 7:31-37 was first told in the Palestinian community despite its use of an Aramaic word (v.34) since it possesses a number of features which are commonly found in the miracle stories of the Hellenistic world of that day. 7:32-34 was possibly an earlier form of this story, v.37 being appended to link the story with the Isaianic prophecy (cf. also the word *μογιλάλον*).<sup>1</sup>

Like Mk. 7:31-37, Mk. 8:22b-26 shows no features which betray its use in the earliest stage of the tradition. It is possible, however, that Mark has so altered this story in order to employ it in connexion with his theme of discipleship<sup>2</sup> that the earlier form is no longer recognizable.

Although Lk. 7:11-17 speaks of Jesus as "a great prophet" (v.16), the account as a whole does not seem to reflect the Christological conception of the earliest Palestinian Church.<sup>3</sup> It would appear, rather, that

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. above, pp. 81-83.    <sup>2</sup>Cf. above, pp. 101-106.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Hahn, p. 392.



this story, perhaps in the light of the Elijah-Elisha cycle (cf. I Ki. 17:17ff. and II Ki. 4:18), was first circulated in a Hellenized part of the Church as a proof of Jesus' lordship over death.

Mt. 14:28-31 is an episode which has developed around Peter and perhaps was first recounted as a homiletical expansion of Mk. 6:45ff. Its obvious purpose is to present a lesson in the meaning of faith. The Christological conception of this section reflects a later stage in the tradition, and it is quite possible that it developed in the Hellenistic Jewish community.

Lk. 5:4-11,<sup>1</sup> portraying Jesus in the light of his post-Resurrection lordship, has probably arisen in a Hellenistic stage of the tradition, possibly on the basis of the saying in Mk. 1:16-20, "Follow me and I will make you become fishers of men." The story was undoubtedly intended to establish the apostolic authority of Peter.

As we have seen,<sup>2</sup> Mt. 17:24-27 is a pronouncement story which during its transmission has assumed a legendary feature (v.27). This suggests that in other

---

<sup>1</sup>Vv.1-3 were probably shaped by Luke on the basis of Mk. 4:1f.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. above, pp. 245-249.

instances (besides Mk. 11:13f., 20f.) what were initially just stories became miracle accounts.

Finally, we must consider the seven miracles recounted in the Gospel of John. It is particularly difficult to determine anything about the form and date of the material which lay behind the present narratives since it has been considerably reworked to serve the Johannine themes. In the case of three of the pericopae (Jn. 4:46-54, 6:1-15, 6:16-21), it seems likely that we have different versions of stories which appear in the Synoptic Gospels even though, as we have seen,<sup>1</sup> there exists little verbal agreement and there is no direct evidence that John has used one or more of the Synoptic accounts. The story of the healing of the nobleman's son (4:46-54) probably had its setting in Capernaum despite the fact that in the fourth Gospel the father comes to Jesus in Cana (cf. 4:46); this would agree with the setting in Mt. 8:5-13/Lk. 7:1-10.<sup>2</sup> Other similarities have already been noted,<sup>3</sup> and in the light of the fact that the primary concern in 4:46-54 is centred on the meaning of real faith and not the Gentile question, an independent

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. above, pp. 408, 421.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Brown, pp. 190, 192.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. above, pp. 408f.

development of the tradition must be presumed.<sup>1</sup> It is probable that the pre-Johannine story did not contain vv.48f.

Similarly, it would appear that Jn. 6:1-21 has enjoyed a different development from that of the Synoptic stories (cf. Mk. 6:30-52 and parallels) and reflects a later stage in the tradition. Our investigation of the Johannine stories has shown that they exhibit an advanced stage of theological reflection. In both 6:1-15 and 6:16-21 the focus is almost exclusively on Jesus as the actor, giving a Christological emphasis, and in 6:1-15 the features with Eucharistic allusions have been accentuated. In addition, the introduction of the names of specific disciples might represent a later development.<sup>2</sup> It must be remembered, of course, that

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. esp. E. Haenchen, "Johanneische Probleme," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, 56 (1959), pp. 23-31, for his consideration of the different versions of this story in the tradition. He concludes that there existed a written and independent pre-Johannine form of this story, in which the major emphasis was upon the deed of Jesus as a "sign." (pp. 28f.) Cf. also Dodd, Hist. Tradition, esp. pp. 193-195. In addition, Dodd sees certain correspondences between Jn. 4:46-54 and Mk. 7:24-30, but these seem much more remote.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. above, pp. 422-428. See also Haenchen, Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, 56 (1959), pp. 31-34, who presumes an independent and later tradition behind Jn. 6:1-21. Cf., however, W. Wilkens, "Evangelist und

John could have introduced many of these features and that it is possible that the pre-Johannine stories preserved certain genuine features of the early tradition. For example, 6:14 might reflect the primitive Mosaic-prophet theology.<sup>1</sup> Certain scholars, moreover, argue that in general Jn. 6:1-21 preserves a more primitive tradition than that found in the Synoptic accounts, but this conclusion seems rather doubtful.<sup>2</sup>

---

Tradition im Johannesevangelium," Theologische Zeitschrift, 16 (1960), pp. 81-90.

<sup>1</sup>Thus Hahn, pp. 392, 397, and Fuller, Christology, p. 171. The Mosaic motif occurs frequently in the Fourth Gospel. For a consideration of this theme, see T. F. Glasson, Moses in the Fourth Gospel ("Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 40"; London, 1963).

<sup>2</sup>Brown, pp. 245-250, is inclined to find certain primitive details in Jn. 6:1-15 such as the Passover setting, the inclusion of Philip and Andrew, the reference to the barley loaves (cf. II Ki. 4:42f.), etc. B. Gärtner, John 6 and the Jewish Passover ("Coniectanea Neotestamentica, No. 17"; Lund, 1959), pp. 6-13, argues that the Johannine version (6:1-21) reproduces more precisely than either Mark or Matthew the original order of the traditional material, but this conclusion presupposes that the Markan order in 6:30-8:31 (cf. Mt. 14:13-16:12) is reliably reproducing early material and not the result, at least in part, of Mark's own arrangement of the material. For this reason Gärtner's conclusions are not wholly convincing. In the remainder of the pamphlet Gärtner attempts to show the correspondence between the Passover celebration in the early Church and Jn. 6, thereby demonstrating the milieu in which this material was preserved. He accepts the references in both 6:4 and 6:59 as authentic, not fictionally created, and assumes that in Jn. 6 we encounter "... concepts native to Jesus' teaching on this common meal [the

In the account of the lame man at the pool in Jerusalem (5:1ff.) and that of the man born blind (9:1ff.), it seems likely that certain traditional material has been greatly expanded. The original pre-Johannine miracle material could have been similar to certain Synoptic stories; nevertheless, it is impossible to judge how primitive this material might be. In the first instance Jn. 5:2-9a might quite closely approximate the pre-Johannine story,<sup>1</sup> and, as we have

---

Passover meal], before the Last Supper cast the shadow of suffering over his word" (p. 42). Cf. also E. D. Johnston, "The Johannine Version of the Feeding of the Five Thousand--an Independent Tradition?," N.T.S., 8 (1961-62), pp. 151-154. See finally H. Montefiore, "Revolt in the Desert?," N.T.S., 8 (1961-62), pp. 135-141, who finds in Jn. 6:14 a clue for reconstructing the historical incident behind Mk. 6:30ff. Regarding 6:16-21, Brown, p. 254, suggests that the Johannine version of Jesus' walking on the water " . . . represents a relatively undeveloped form of the story." He bases this conclusion on the brevity of the Johannine story and its lack of stress on the miraculous; however, these features lead us to the opposite conclusion that in Jn. 6:16-21 the miraculous elements have been displaced because of John's preoccupation with the theological import of the story. Cf. again C. H. Dodd, Studies in the Gospels, ed. D. E. Nineham, pp. 23f. (thus also Dodd, Hist. Tradition, pp. 198f.), who asserts that Jn. 6:16-21 contains more of the features of a post-Resurrection story than does Mk. 6:45-51.

<sup>1</sup>Brown, pp. 206f., 209, points out that in view of certain Jerusalem excavations in this century the details recounted particularly in v.2 are accurate. To proceed to declare, as he does (p. 209), that these details " . . . betray a knowledge of Jerusalem that militates against a late or non-Palestinian origin of



seen,<sup>1</sup> vv.8,9a are particularly reminiscent of the story of the healing of the paralytic in Mk. 2:1-12. In the second story (9:1ff.), it is extremely difficult to determine what portion, if any, goes back to an early stage of the tradition.<sup>2</sup> V.1 could have been part of an earlier story; however, the conversation in vv.2-5 appears to be a late insertion or a rewriting on the basis of an earlier section. The actual description of the miracle in vv.6f. is probably pre-Johannine but beyond this it is difficult to determine traditional material.

The account of the Cana miracle of the wine (Jn. 2:1-11) has no parallel in the Synoptic Gospels, and it is often assumed that the original story was borrowed from the Hellenistic world.<sup>3</sup> Other scholars<sup>4</sup> call

---

the story" is not warranted. See particularly J. Jeremias, "The Copper Scroll from Qumran," E.T., 71 (1959-60), pp. 227f., and J. Jeremias, The Rediscovery of Bethesda, translation ed. J. Vardaman ("New Testament Archaeology Monograph, No. 1"; Louisville, Ky., 1966). Cf. finally, D. J. Wieand, "John V.2 and the Pool of Bethesda," N.T.S., 12 (1965-66), pp. 392-404.

<sup>1</sup>Cf. above, p. 415.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Dodd, Hist. Tradition, pp. 181-188, and Brown, pp. 378f.

<sup>3</sup>In the light of the Dionysiac legend, Bultmann (Johannes, p. 83), in particular, concludes that the original story was derived from a non-Christian milieu.

attention to the passage in Philo (Leg. Alleg. III. 82) in which he speaks about Melchizedek, who "shall bring forth wine of water and give our souls a pure draught, that they may become possessed by that divine intoxication which is more sober than sobriety itself; for he is the priest-logos, and has for his portion the Self-existent."<sup>1</sup> According to some, this Philonic material might provide a key to the origin of the Johannine story. In addition, Dodd<sup>2</sup> conjectures that the original nucleus of the story was a parable which only subsequently assumed the miraculous features. In the light of this maze of attempts to explain the origin of this story in tradition, we would be inclined to conclude that it arose in a relatively late stage of the tradition, perhaps as one of a cycle of stories involving Mary,<sup>3</sup> and that it contains little or no actually reliable historical information.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>Thus Dodd, Interpretation, pp. 298f.; Barrett, John, p. 157; Lagrange, Jean, p. 62.

<sup>1</sup>As quoted in Dodd, Interpretation, p. 298.

<sup>2</sup>Hist. Tradition, p. 227.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Leroy, op. cit., pp. 171-173.

<sup>4</sup>Cf., however, Brown, pp. 101-103, who attempts a partial reconstruction of the historical situation.

Finally the story of the raising of Lazarus (Jn. 11:1ff.) must be considered. It has sometimes been suggested that Jn. 11:1ff. developed out of the parable which is related in Lk. 16:19-31. R. Dunkerley,<sup>1</sup> however, reverses this theory and argues that after hearing about Lazarus' illness in Bethany Jesus related the (Lukan) parable to his disciples with this real situation in mind. Since Dunkerley's argument is based upon the presupposition that the Synoptic Gospels and the fourth Gospel complement one another in providing a historical picture of Jesus' ministry, his conclusion is not really convincing. As another attempt to probe behind the Johannine story, W. Wilkens<sup>2</sup> has not only suggested what the pre-Johannine form of this story might have been<sup>3</sup> but also has indicated its earlier form as a miracle story which contained none of the sections depicting Jesus' conversations with his disciples and the two sisters of Lazarus. In any case, all attempts at reconstruction of the original form of the story are uncertain since the present narrative possesses such a

---

<sup>1</sup>"Lazarus," N.T.S., 5 (1958-59), pp. 321-327.

<sup>2</sup>Theologische Zeitschrift, 15 (1959), pp. 23-28.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. also Fuller, Miracles, pp. 95f., for his tentative reconstruction of the material in John's source.

definite Johannine stamp.<sup>1</sup>

All in all, it is obvious that the Johannine narratives show definite signs of a developed theological position, and, as a result, we find it difficult to recreate the form of the stories at any stage prior to their use by John. There is nothing which we can safely assert here about the oral stage which has not already emerged in our discussion of the early history of the Synoptic miracle stories.

In our study of the miracle stories in the early tradition we have discovered evidence to suggest that most of them originated in the Palestinian period. At that time they were primarily fashioned in the light of a prophet-servant Christology. It seems likely that in many of these stories the illness or disturbance in the patients or in nature itself was related to the destructive work of the demonic. For the Palestinian Church Jesus' healings and exorcisms indicated that he was an extraordinary prophet who had the power of God with him, and it was thought that his work was ushering in the Kingdom of God which would be established in all its

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Dodd, Hist. Tradition, pp. 229-232, who attempts to show the correspondences in the Lazarus story to Mk. 9:14-27 and Mk. 5:21-43.

power and glory at the Parousia. Already in the Palestinian stage of the tradition certain other themes relevant to the early Church's life had been linked with reports of Jesus' miracles.

It is likely that in the Hellenistic Jewish sections of the Church the earlier stories were slightly revised. This alteration consisted primarily in the application of Christological titles--especially the Son of David and the Son of God--to Jesus in connexion with his earthly activity. A few stories recounting miracles of Jesus probably received their form in this stage either as creative expansions of traditional material or as variants of stories already known.

In Hellenistic Gentile Christianity the miracle stories which had been transmitted from the earlier stages of the tradition provided material easily adaptable to the Hellenistic concept of "the divine man." Marginal features were inserted into existing stories and in at least a few instances entire stories were formulated in this late stage. The miracle stories in Hellenistic Gentile Christianity served to emphasize that Jesus possessed the miraculous powers which could only be ascribed to God (or, in pagan terms, to the gods) and was thus divine himself.



In view of such development and changing interpretation of the stories about Jesus' miracles we find it impossible to maintain that the present forms of the Gospel miracle stories have resulted from the direct testimony of eyewitnesses and, therefore, necessarily preserve accurate historical reports of specific events in the ministry of Jesus. On the other hand, we discover no convincing reasons to assign most of the miracle stories to the later strata of the tradition. Some form of most of the canonical miracle stories were probably circulated in the Palestinian Church. It is obvious that the stories which originated in this earliest tradition would have the greatest likelihood of presenting a reliable picture of Jesus' activity; nonetheless, it cannot be assumed that the circulation of a story in the Palestinian period guarantees its historicity. The oral repetition of stories even in this stage could have introduced new features and resulted in certain alterations.

In most cases we are left with the question regarding the relationship between a story and its historical basis. If we realize, however, that events are inevitably interpreted before they possess any real meaning for people and that "historical facts" per se

do not exist,<sup>1</sup> we do not despair in the face of a degree of uncertainty about the historical value of some details of the miracle stories, or, in certain instances, of entire stories. The early Christians were primarily concerned to acknowledge Jesus as the Son of God and to proclaim the meaning of his ministry in the light of his Passion and Resurrection.

---

<sup>1</sup>D. E. Nineham, "Eye-Witness Testimony and the Gospel Tradition, III," J.T.S., 11 (1960), p. 259, makes the following comment: "Even if the gospels consisted exclusively of eye-witness testimony, they would still have to abide the historian's question."

## CHAPTER VI

### CONCLUSION

We began with an examination of the second evangelist's use of miracle stories since Mark is the earliest Gospel and comprises the major source for Matthew and Luke. Accepting the conclusion of most scholars that Mark was written in Rome (i.e., Hellenistic Gentile Christianity) we were immediately faced with certain problems. How much had the traditional material been altered between the time of its origin and that of its arrival in the hands of Mark? Moreover, just how much material about Jesus was available to Mark from which to select and to write his Gospel? Judging from the preponderance of miracle stories and the paucity of relatively lengthy sections which recount the content of Jesus' teaching in this earliest and shortest of the canonical Gospels, there is good reason to suppose that stories relating the miracles

of Jesus were abundant in the Gentile Christian circles.<sup>1</sup> Such stories were probably enthusiastically preserved and often embellished with features which were intended to underline Jesus' divine nature and his execution of the prerogatives belonging to God. In other words, by the time the miracle stories reached Mark they had been largely adapted to the Hellenistic conception of "the divine man" (θεῖος ἄνθρωπος). This does not mean, however, that these miracle stories appearing in Mark originated in the Hellenistic Gentile milieu since in most cases features or emphases of the earlier stages of the tradition are still detectable.

We have concluded that Mark was willing to use these miracle stories, with a particular emphasis upon Jesus' authority over the evil spirits, to make up a large part of the picture of Jesus' ministry between his Baptism and his Passion but was forced to reconcile their obvious epiphany Christology with the different stress on the obedience and suffering of Jesus evidenced in the

---

<sup>1</sup>Reversing his earlier position that Q was known in the section of the Church in which Mark wrote his Gospel and that he had intended only to supplement rather than supersede it, Streeter (pp. 186-191) comes to the conclusion that the second evangelist did not use Q; it would seem to follow that he did not in fact know the Q tradition.

narrative sections which reported his arrest, trial and crucifixion. He has accomplished this by developing the secrecy motif. In Mark not even the disciples are able to penetrate behind the miracles to a true recognition of who Jesus is; for Mark faith could not result from witnessing Jesus' miracles but was possible only after his death and Resurrection. Nonetheless, the miracle stories had a positive value for Mark's readers. Their faith had resulted from the preaching of the cross and Resurrection of Christ and, therefore, these stories were able to reinforce their faith in Jesus as the Son of God.

Both Matthew and Luke have considerably modified the Hellenistic idea of "the divine man" which is prominent in the Markan miracle stories. Although the two later evangelists have achieved this differently, in each instance Jesus as "the divine man" is defined much more in Old Testament terms than is the case in Mark. It seems likely that these modifications occurred in Hellenistic Jewish Christianity since both Matthew and Luke were probably written in this section of the Church.

Matthew has quite consistently shown little interest in the miraculous elements of the Markan stories, normally abbreviating them to highlight some theme which he has



discovered in the Markan account and which would be pertinent to the Matthean congregation. Consequently, the Matthean versions of the miracle stories, including those which were not derived from the second Gospel, are important because of their didactic value and in many respects tend to resemble paradigms. By including a considerable amount of the content of Jesus' teaching and by radically departing from the Markan format Matthew has been able to design a picture of Jesus' ministry in which the authority of Jesus' words and deeds are equally stressed. In addition, the first evangelist has largely disregarded the Markan emphasis upon the special knowledge of the supernatural spirits and the secrecy motif which accompanies it and has rather taken pains to demonstrate that the whole ministry of Jesus--both his words and his deeds--are in accord with the Old Testament Scripture and thus the will of God. All in all, Matthew's presentation of the miracle stories approximates far more closely than that of Mark their use in the earliest Palestinian tradition when they were interpreted in terms of a prophet-servant Christology. Matthew's frequent use of "the Son of David" title as related to the acts of mercy done by Jesus in his earthly ministry is not out of line with the earliest Palestinian

Christology even though this title originally carried eschatological import. Further, he has linked Jesus' deeds more firmly with the servant-type Christology by his greater emphasis upon them as acts of compassion. It is obvious, however, that Matthew's reworking of the Markan stories was by no means a conscious endeavour to recapture their form in the earliest tradition since he has often imported the situation of the Church of his time and place into them (e.g., its language of worship) as well as adapting them to address more directly the needs of his time.

Unlike Matthew, Luke has been far less concerned to modify the miracle stories to emphasize specific themes relevant to the Church of his day and location. Rather, he has retained the stories in more or less their Markan form, principally altering only language or improving style and occasionally adding details to heighten the drama or pathos of the situation. Luke has apparently intended to portray the time of Jesus' ministry as a definable period in history after which came the presence of the Holy Spirit among the early believers and the era of the Church. In the book of Acts the third evangelist has made it clear that the apostles perpetuated the work of the exalted Lord when they healed in the name of Jesus.

During his earthly ministry Jesus alone was endowed with the Spirit, and it was this fact which allowed him to perform miracles and, in particular, to exercise control over the evil spirits, all of which demonstrated that God was at work through him. More than any other aspect of his presentation, it was the Lukan emphasis upon Jesus' endowment with the Spirit which counteracted the concept of "the divine man" as pictured in extreme Hellenism. For Luke Jesus was the Spirit-filled prophet attested by the mighty works which God accomplished through him. Such a portrayal of Jesus was much more in line with the Old Testament "divine man" concept and, as in Matthew, constituted a more functional than ontological-type Christology. In Luke the functional value of the miracles is particularly stressed by means of the reactions of the witnesses; they praise God after seeing a miracle of Jesus. Although it would be wrong to conclude that Luke was interested in the miraculous for its own sake, it is clear that for him, more so than for Matthew, the deeds of Jesus took precedence over his teaching. "Seeing" what Jesus did prepared the way for "hearing" the real import of Jesus' words. For the third evangelist the miracles revealed that God had sent a great prophet among his people, and, therefore, unlike what we found

in Mark, Jesus' deeds possessed certain revelatory significance which could be comprehended by those who saw them. By depicting Jesus as the Spirit-filled divine man in the Old Testament sense, Luke has had no reason to reproduce the Markan secrecy motif. As in Matthew, the disciples and crowds are by no means blind to the importance of Jesus' deeds.

The fourth evangelist has presented Jesus' entire ministry as a divine epiphany. In this respect he has developed the concept of "the divine man" beyond what we discovered in Mark since in the latter only a number of individual stories portray Jesus in those terms. John's Gospel, however, represents a new theological formulation of Jesus' ministry which presupposes a later period in the Church and the emergence of a need to present the gospel to the Hellenistic world in fresh terms; it does not involve a crass emphasis upon Jesus as "the divine man" whose miraculous activity astounds all who witness it. In fact, John has shown little interest in the miraculous per se but has rooted this epiphany Christology in his fundamental theme revolving around Jesus' intimate relationship with the Father. For John Jesus was the divine Son sent from the Father, and his works manifested the glory of God among men. The fourth

evangelist alone has designated Jesus' miracles as signs whose purpose is to point to Jesus' real identity and to indicate the benefits which issue from his presence among men. Although for John the miracles were actual events in Jesus' ministry, they possessed rich symbolic value.

In at least one respect, John's use of the miracle stories has an affinity with that of Mark. In each case, Jesus' acts possess a certain enigmatic character. For Mark the miracles were not understood and prompted only amazement and unbelief; although for John the signs were able to bring a person to faith in Jesus when the externals were penetrated and they were recognized as the works of God, their real significance was frequently missed, resulting in either a superficial attachment to Jesus or outright disbelief. In other words, as in Mark the acts of the Johannine Jesus are not so overwhelmingly convincing that the witnesses cannot avoid believing in the one who performs them. Whereas in Mark the Caesarea Philippi episode serves as the turning point, after which the significance of Jesus' Passion for faith and discipleship is progressively clarified, in John the Passion is viewed as the final hour of Jesus' glorification and casts its shadow back over the entire ministry of Jesus. In both cases, it is obvious that Christian



faith is rooted in Jesus' death and Resurrection, but the miracle stories play a slightly different role in each Gospel. For Mark they were acts of power which only caused amazement since the events of the Passion were yet to come; for John they were signs which could initiate faith in the beholder since the glory which culminated in the cross and Resurrection was visible from the very outset of Jesus' ministry.

The fourth evangelist has not only linked the signs closely with the response of faith but also has associated them with Jesus' teaching. Matthew has placed Jesus' words in juxtaposition to his deeds as signs of the Kingdom and proofs of his Messianic mission. John, however, has frequently allowed the teaching of Jesus to develop out of a concrete situation in which his miraculous action is demonstrated, or, to state it another way, the fourth evangelist has employed the discourses of Jesus to interpret his deeds, i.e., the signs. To a greater extent than in the Synoptic Gospels, John has creatively fashioned the narrative and discourse sections to draw out the theological implications of Jesus' mission to men, and this has resulted in the formation of a Gospel which is fairly unified. Consequently, the sign narratives with their various participants contribute directly to the

development of the action in the whole Gospel. There are fewer miracle accounts in the fourth Gospel but they have been chosen carefully because of their unique function.

In summary we have discovered the following pattern in the transmission and use of the miracle stories: (a) in the earliest Palestinian period the miracles of Jesus were interpreted in the light of a Mosaic prophet-servant Christology, and the whole of Jesus' earthly mission was expected to be vindicated when the Son of man figure returned in the Eschaton; (b) in the Hellenistic Jewish stage of the tradition, especially in view of the delay of the Parousia, certain Christological titles (including the Son of David) were applied to Jesus in regard to his earthly work and particularly his miracles; (c) in Gentile Christianity the miracle stories were largely accommodated to the Hellenistic concept of "the divine man"; (d) Mark was required to fit the Christology of these stories with the Passion narrative, and he chose to do this by means of the device of the Messianic secret; (e) Matthew has de-emphasized the Hellenistic divine man motif, pruning the crassly miraculous features of the stories to provide teaching aids for his Church, and has particularly linked Jesus' ministry of word and

deed with the Old Testament's conception of the servant Messiah who compassionately heals and saves his people; (f) Luke has given a certain priority to the deeds of Jesus but has modified the Hellenistic idea of "the divine man" by depicting Jesus as the Spirit-filled prophet attested by the mighty acts which God did through him; and finally (g) John has portrayed Jesus throughout his Gospel as the divine Son whose mission is to do the work of the Father and without any special interest in the miraculous for its own sake has termed the miracles as signs whose ultimate purpose is to bring people to faith in Jesus as the sole revealer of God.

## APPENDIX

### THE MIRACLES OF JESUS IN THE APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS (Second Century)

Following a study of the miracles of Jesus as recounted in the four canonical Gospels, it is natural to wonder what, if any, additional material about Jesus' miracles is presented in later gospels--many of which are fragmentary and/or largely reconstructed on the basis of references in other writings--which circulated in the second century and have been designated "apocryphal." We do not presume to consider in detail all the pertinent evidence from available primary and secondary sources regarding this subject but deliberately limit ourselves to that material about the apocryphal gospels collected and presented so admirably in the first volume of the English edition of Hennecke's work.<sup>1</sup> Our only intent in the following pages is to indicate at least a few noticeable tendencies in these later references to

---

<sup>1</sup>E. Hennecke, New Testament Apocrypha, vol. 1, ed. W. Schneemelcher and English translation ed. R. McL. Wilson (London, 1963).

the miracles of Jesus.

Since it has been established that prior to the formation of the canonical Gospels the sayings of Jesus and accounts about his deeds circulated in the earliest stage of the tradition as independent units, it is possible that some elements of reliable tradition could be present in certain of these second century gospels (e.g., the Jewish Christian gospels, the Gospel of the Egyptians, the Gospel of Thomas).<sup>1</sup> Such reliable features could have been preserved by means of the oral tradition which undoubtedly continued for a considerable period of time after written sources had been well established.

In only two instances in the second century apocryphal gospels do we find different versions of miracle stories already appearing in the Synoptic Gospels, but these materials are so fragmentary that we can learn little or nothing about the second century attitude towards the canonical miracle stories. We can observe, however, that in each case certain details have been reduced while others have been expanded. An account of the healing of the leper is included in Papyrus Egerton 2<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 78.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 96f. (the second fragment containing lines 32 to 41).



and while it contains verbal reminiscences of the accounts which occur in the Synoptic Gospels (Mk. 1:40ff. and parallels) it also indicates the reason for the man's becoming a leper. According to Jeremias, this feature of the narrative (his wandering with lepers) together with the final note that the cleansed leper is to show himself to "the" priests (thus plural) suggests that the author was not intimately acquainted with the Palestinian circumstances.<sup>1</sup> This additional material does not, therefore, preserve primitive detail but is only a later enlargement.

It seems likely that some version of the story of the man with the withered hand (cf. Mk. 3:1-5 and parallels) was included in the Gospel of the Nazareans, a Jewish Christian writing partially reconstructed on the basis of references in the Church fathers and dated in the second century. In his Commentary on Matthew (on 12:13) Jerome claims that the gospel which the Nazarenes and the Ebionites used reported the man with the withered hand as saying: "I was a mason and earned [my] livelihood with [my] hands; I beseech thee, Jesus, to restore to me my health that I may not with ignominy have to beg

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 95f.

for my bread."<sup>1</sup> As was the case in the story of the leper, the secondary nature of this expansion is apparent and seems to have been included because of a social motive.<sup>2</sup> Both these secondary enlargements indicate an interest in the patient, not the miraculous deed of Jesus itself.

Apart from these variations of two Synoptic stories which report miracles accomplished by Jesus, there is little evidence that the second century gospels included many stories describing miracles performed by Jesus during his ministry which are not recorded in the canonical Gospels.<sup>3</sup> That this is apparently the case, however, is understandable since, as we have seen, the canonical Gospels supply us with numerous examples of miraculous deeds accomplished by Jesus during this period. In the first few centuries writers were inclined to make reference to the miracles of Jesus by means of a brief

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 147f.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 144f.

<sup>3</sup>Cf., however, ibid., p. 97, where in the Papyrus Egerton 2 lines 60-75 recount a scene in which Jesus' sowing of a grain of wheat near the Jordan results in an immediate growth and yield of fruit. Although this passage is fragmentary, it would appear that this miracle was intended to illustrate to Jesus' disciples the power of God which can bring life out of death (thus, p. 95).

summary passage like the one in Mt. 11:5/Lk. 7:22.<sup>1</sup>

As a specific example of this technique we cite a passage in the Abgar legend.<sup>2</sup> In a letter written to Jesus, King Abgar V of Edessa declares,

I have heard of thee and of thy healings, that they are done by thee without drugs and herbs. For as it is said, thou dost make blind men see again and lame walk, and dost cleanse lepers, and cast out unclean spirits and demons, and heal those tormented by long disease, and raise the dead."<sup>3</sup>

Thus, rather than a great proliferation of stories about the miracles of Jesus occurring during the years of his ministry, a number of other developments gained impetus in the second century. As already hinted at above, popular interest was lavished upon the participants in the canonical stories, many of whom had only incidental roles. For example, although in the canonical Gospel miracle stories the patients normally remain anonymous due to the emphasis of the Christological theme, they are often given names in the later tradition.

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. ibid., p. 435, for the appropriate references in the early writings to substantiate the frequency of this practice.

<sup>2</sup>This story is first recounted by Eusebius (H.E. I. 13; II.1.6-8). The complicated questions surrounding the origin and aim of this legend are not important for our purposes. Cf. ibid., pp. 437-440.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 441 (as found in Eusebius, H.E. I.13.5ff.).

This process did occur in a few instances already in the New Testament period but during the second and following centuries it became more prevalent.<sup>1</sup> In addition, a great mass of literature came into being, giving details about the relatives of Jesus, particularly Mary and Joseph. Perhaps the supreme example of a second century document whose principal design was for the glorification of a person, namely Mary, is found in the Protevangelium of James.<sup>2</sup> Although the birth of Jesus is recounted, the major interest of the author lay with the miraculous birth of Mary herself, the years of her youth in the temple and her virginity.

As we have noted at various times throughout our consideration of the canonical Gospels, Jesus commissioned his disciples to heal the sick and cast out evil spirits. In the Synoptic Gospels the fact that they did do this is reported in summary passages. In the book of Acts we encounter, in addition to such references, more elaborate descriptions of the miracles accomplished by the apostles in the name of Jesus. As it might be supposed, in certain sectors of the second century Church tendencies to

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf., e.g., ibid., pp. 151f., 457.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 370-388.

glorify these earliest apostles were inevitable. Undoubtedly, it was initially on the basis of a lively oral tradition which was later put into writing that the miraculous accomplishments of these early saints (e.g., John, Peter and Paul) became exaggerated and invested with innumerable legendary features. To assess the nature of these stories about the apostles is beyond the scope of our study since our concern rests with the miracles of Jesus.<sup>1</sup>

Since, as we have noted, there was no need to increase the number of the miracles of Jesus which occurred during his earthly ministry, it is not really surprising that certain groups in second century Christianity turned their attention to the time in Jesus' life prior to his Baptism and ministry for there was a paucity of evidence in the canonical Gospels about this period. Only the Gospels of Matthew and Luke have provided us with any stories which relate the circumstances surrounding Jesus' birth, and Luke alone has included anything relating to the period between Jesus' birth and ministry--the story concerning Jesus' visit to the temple when he was twelve

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. E. Hennecke, New Testament Apocrypha, vol. 2, ed. W. Schneemelcher and English translation ed. R. McL. Wilson (London, 1965).



years old (Lk. 2:41-51). In view of this silence about the early years of Jesus' life, there was ample room for speculation resulting in the emergence of stories to fill this gap. The Infancy Gospel of Thomas sets forth the most fanciful picture of the earliest years of Jesus' life, portraying him as the playful little boy who in all sorts of miraculous pranks exhibits his displeasure and anger.<sup>1</sup> Rather than enumerate the details of these legendary stories about this wonder boy Jesus, it seems best to indicate the features which are observable. Undoubtedly, certain of the miraculous deeds performed by the boy Jesus were intended to anticipate the miracles recounted in the time of his ministry (cf. esp. 17:1f.).<sup>2</sup> The episodes included in this apocryphal gospel provide crass examples of marvellous acts designed to demonstrate that already in his childhood Jesus was fully divine (7:2,4; 17:2; 18:2). The boy Jesus is filled with the Holy Spirit (10:2; 15:2); his every word is an accomplished deed (4:1; 5:2); he is worshipped because of his miraculous deeds (9:3; 10:2; 18:1); and on one occasion he is

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Hennecke, New Testament Apocrypha, vol. 1, pp. 392-401.

<sup>2</sup>The references to the appropriate passages are cited as given in the Hennecke volume.

even addressed as "Lord" (9:3). Although certain of the miracles performed by the boy Jesus have beneficial effects (9:1-3; 12:1f.; 17:1f.), the most striking characteristic of this Gospel's portrayal of the young Jesus is the repeated emphasis upon his quickness to curse every person who in any way provokes him (3:1-3; 4:1f.; 5:2; 8:2; 14:2f.). It is reported that Joseph is often blamed on account of the unpredictable pranks of young Jesus (2:3; 3:3; 4:2; 5:1), but it is made clear that neither Joseph nor the various teachers who attempt to teach Jesus have any success in controlling him. Rather, they are controlled by the boy (5:2f.; 6:1-4; 7:1-4). In fact, all are perplexed and fearful in the presence of this young wonder worker (5:2; 7:2; 14:1).

It is at once obvious that these stories have little in common with those in the canonical Gospels. Here the interest in the miraculous has become blatant. The more marvellous an episode was, the more it apparently pleased the author of this document. All sorts of extraneous material have been introduced into these stories about the boy Jesus for no apparent reason, and, as O. Cullmann states, "If the 'child' or 'boy' were not actually called Jesus, no one would guess that the tales of this playful divine boy were intended to supplement the tradition

about him."<sup>1</sup> It should be noted that the account of Jesus' visit to the temple at the age of twelve which is told in Luke with obvious restraint is considerably exaggerated here (19:1-5).<sup>2</sup> In this infancy gospel we have the results of the popular interest in the miraculous for its own sake with no apparent concern to be guided by theological themes. It would appear that this apocryphal gospel prepared the way for further speculation about the early years of Jesus' life, often in Gnostic circles.<sup>3</sup>

In addition to this crass emphasis on the miraculous in the early years of Jesus' life, there is also evidence that the final period of his earthly life including his trial and crucifixion in Jerusalem--which in the canonical Gospels is almost completely devoid of a display of the miraculous--became invested with certain spectacular features already during the second and third centuries. Particularly noteworthy for our purposes is the place given to the subject of Jesus' miracles in the document, Acts of Pilate.<sup>4</sup> In the trial before Pilate the Jews

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 391.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 398f.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., pp. 401-417 (including the legends from Pistis Sophia and the later infancy gospels).

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., pp. 444-470. Although the testimony of Justin to the Acts of Pilate is suspect and the oldest extant Greek version is dated 425 A.D., we have the

charge that Jesus has healed on the sabbath (I.1; II.5; IV.2; VI.1)<sup>1</sup> and that he is a sorcerer who casts out evil spirits by Beelzebub (I.1; II.1,5).<sup>2</sup> In contrast, Nicodemus and the various persons healed by Jesus (mentioned in the canonical stories) testify on Jesus' behalf before Pilate (V; VI; VII; VIII).<sup>3</sup> As well as the dream of his wife this writing also mentions Pilate's experiences of fear in the midst of these proceedings against Jesus (II.1; VIII; XI.2).<sup>4</sup> In addition to these references to the miracles of Jesus during the trial before Pilate, there is at least one example of a legendary feature being introduced. When Jesus was ushered into the hall for judgement before Pilate, the images of the emperor on the standards held by the standard-bearers bowed down and did reverence before him (I.5,6).<sup>5</sup> An episode such as this proved beyond all doubt that Jesus was divine and superior to the pagan gods.

In the second century and onwards there emerged

---

reliable witness of Epiphanius (375 or 376 A.D.) to this document, and it is quite possible that the Christian Acts of Pilate first circulated in an earlier period (perhaps late second or third century).

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 451,454f.,457.    <sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 451,453f.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., pp. 456f.    <sup>4</sup>Ibid., pp. 453,457,460.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., pp. 452f.

considerable literature, much of it Gnostic in character, which recounted post-Resurrection and post-Ascension appearances of Jesus. Again a careful consideration of this material is beyond the scope of this study.

The developments in the second century directly relevant to the miracles of Jesus have apparently been principally in two directions. First, the early years of Jesus' life, about which the canonical Gospels present little material, offered considerable room for speculation, and evidently a large number of stories were imaginatively created to prove that as a boy Jesus was wholly divine and possessed miraculous powers. The other phase of this development occurred in connexion with the events of the Passion; this period was more richly supplied with references to Jesus' miraculous power in order to testify that he was no ordinary man but the Son of God.<sup>1</sup>

Although we ended chapter V of our study by stating that we can not be extremely confident about the historical reliability of all the details of the canonical miracle stories, our quick look at the later apocryphal

---

<sup>1</sup>In passing we note that in the Gospel of Peter (9:35-13:57) the account of the Resurrection is reported in such a materialistic fashion that it resembles a miracle story (ibid., pp. 185-187.).



developments has provided a healthy corrective to the skepticism which sees no value in the miracle stories in the canonical Gospels. In contrast to much of the apocryphal material in which an interest in the miraculous has run rampant, the canonical stories exhibit considerable restraint and obviously present us with a much more accurate picture of Jesus, his work and his mission.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### A. BOOKS

- Allen, W. C. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew. (The International Critical Commentary) Edinburgh, 1912.
- Arndt, W. F., and Gingrich, F. W. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Chicago, 1957.
- Bacon, B. W. The Gospel of Mark: Its Composition and Date. New Haven, Conn., 1925.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Studies in Matthew. London, 1930.
- Bailey, J. A. The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John. (Supplement to Novum Testamentum, vol. 7) Leiden, 1963.
- Barrett, C. K. The Gospel according to St. John. London, 1955.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition. London, 1947.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Luke the Historian in Recent Study. London, 1961.
- Bauer, W. Das Johannesevangelium. (Handbuch zum neuen Testament) 2nd ed. Tübingen, 1925.
- Bauernfeind, O. Die Worte der Dämonen im Markusevangelium. Stuttgart, 1927.
- Bernard, J. H. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John. (The International Critical Commentary) 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1928.

- Best, E. The Temptation and the Passion: The Markan Soteriology. (The Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, No. 2) Cambridge, 1965.
- Black, M. An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts. 2nd ed. Oxford, 1954.
- Black, M., and Rowley, H. H. (ed.) Peake's Commentary on the Bible. Revised ed. London, 1962.
- Bonnard, P. L'Évangile selon Saint Matthieu. (Commentaire du Nouveau Testament) Neuchatel, 1963.
- Borgen, P. Bread from Heaven: An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo. (Supplement to Novum Testamentum, vol. 10) Leiden, 1965.
- Bornhäuser, K. Studien zum Sondergut des Lukas. Gütersloh, 1934.
- Bornkamm, G., Barth, G., and Held, H. J. Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew. Translated by P. Scott. London, 1963.
- Bousset, W. Jesus. Translated by J. P. Trevelyan. London, 1906.
- Bowman, J. The Gospel of Mark: The New Christian Passover Haggadah. Leiden, 1965.
- Branscomb, B. H. The Gospel of Mark. (The Moffatt New Testament Commentary) London, 1937.
- Brown, R. E. The Gospel according to John (i-xii). (The Anchor Bible, vol. 29) Garden City, New York, 1966.
- Bultmann, R. Das Evangelium des Johannes. (Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament) 16th ed. Göttingen, 1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Glauben und Verstehen. Vol. 1. Tübingen, 1961.

- \_\_\_\_\_. The History of the Synoptic Tradition.  
Translated by J. Marsh. Oxford, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Jesus and the Word. Translated by L. P. Smith  
and E. Huntress. London, 1935.
- Bultmann, R., and Kundsinn, K. Form Criticism. Translated  
by F. C. Grant. New York, 1962.
- Burkill, T. A. Mysterious Revelation. Ithaca, New York,  
1963.
- Buttrick, G. A. (ed.) The Interpreter's Bible. 12 vols.  
New York and Nashville, Tenn., 1951-57.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (ed.) The Interpreter's Dictionary of the  
Bible. 4 vols. New York and Nashville, Tenn.,  
1962.
- Cadbury, H. J. The Making of Luke-Acts. 2nd ed. London,  
1958. This printing, 1961.
- Caird, G. B. The Gospel of St. Luke. (The Pelican  
Gospel Commentaries) London, 1963.
- Conzelmann, H. The Theology of St. Luke. Translated by  
G. Buswell. London, 1960.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. The Gospel according to Saint Mark.  
Cambridge, 1959.
- Creed, J. M. The Gospel according to St. Luke. London,  
1930.
- Cullmann, O. Early Christian Worship. Translated by  
A. S. Todd and J. B. Torrance. (Studies in  
Biblical Theology, No. 10) London, 1953.
- Daube, D. The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism.  
London, 1956.
- Davies, W. D. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. 2nd ed.  
London, 1955.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount.  
Cambridge, 1964.

- Dibelius, M. Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums.  
Addenda by G. Iber. 5th ed. Tübingen, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. From Tradition to Gospel. Translated by  
B. L. Woolf. London, 1934.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Message of Jesus. Translated by F. C.  
Grant. London, 1939.
- Dodd, C. H. The Apostolic Preaching and Its Develop-  
ments. London, 1936. This edition, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel.  
Cambridge, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel.  
Cambridge, 1953.
- \_\_\_\_\_. New Testament Studies. Manchester, 1953.
- Duncan, G. S. Jesus, Son of Man. London, 1948.
- Easton, B. S. The Gospel before the Gospels. London,  
1928.
- Ebeling, H. J. Das Messiasgeheimnis und die Botschaft  
des Marcus-Evangelisten. (Beihefte zur Zeit-  
schrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft)  
Berlin, 1939.
- Farrer, A. A Study in St. Mark. London, 1951
- Fascher, E. Die formgeschichtliche Methode. (Beihefte  
zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche  
Wissenschaft, No. 2) Giessen, 1924.
- Fenner, F. Die Krankheit im Neuen Testament. Leipzig,  
1930.
- Fenton, J. C. Saint Matthew. (The Pelican Gospel  
Commentaries) London, 1963.
- Feuillet, A. Études Johanniques. Paris, 1962.
- Fiebig, P. Jüdische Wundergeschichten des neutestament-  
lichen Zeitalters. Tübingen, 1911.



Filson, F. V. A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew. (Black's New Testament Commentaries) London, 1960.

Fuller, R. H. The Foundations of New Testament Christology. London, 1965.

\_\_\_\_\_. Interpreting the Miracles. London, 1963.

Gärtner, B. John 6 and the Jewish Passover. (Coniectanea Neotestamentica, No. 17) Lund, 1959.

Georgi, D. Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief. Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1964.

Gerhardsson, B. Memory and Manuscript. Translated by E. J. Sharpe. (Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis 22) Uppsala, 1961.

\_\_\_\_\_. Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity. Translated by E. J. Sharpe. (Coniectanea Neotestamentica, No. 20) Lund, 1964.

Gilmour, S. MacL. "The Gospel according to St. Luke," The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by G. A. Buttrick. Vol. 8. New York and Nashville, Tenn., 1952.

Glasson, T. F. Moses in the Fourth Gospel. (Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 40) London, 1963.

Gould, E. P. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Mark. (The International Critical Commentary) Edinburgh, 1896.

Grant, F. C. "The Gospel according to St. Mark," The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by G. A. Buttrick. Vol. 7. New York and Nashville, Tenn., 1951.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Gospels: Their Origin and their Growth. London, 1957.

Grant, R. M. Miracle and Natural Law in Graeco-Roman and Early Christian Thought. Amsterdam, 1952.

Grundmann, W. Das Evangelium nach Lukas. (Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament) 2nd ed. completely reworked. Berlin, [1964].

- \_\_\_\_\_. Das Evangelium nach Markus. (Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament) 2nd ed. revised. Berlin, [1962].
- Haenchen, E. Die Apostelgeschichte. (Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament) 12th ed. Göttingen, 1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Der Weg Jesu. Berlin, 1966.
- Hahn, F. Christologische Hoheitstitel. Göttingen, 1963.
- Hennecke, E. New Testament Apocrypha. Edited by W. Schneemelcher and English translation edited by R. McL. Wilson. 2 vols. London, 1963-65.
- Higgins, A. J. B. (ed.) New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson 1893-1958. Manchester, 1959.
- Holtzmann, O. Das Johannesevangelium. Darmstadt, 1887.
- Hoskyns, E. C. The Fourth Gospel. Edited by F. N. Davey. 2 vols. London, 1940.
- Hoskyns, E., and Davey, N. The Riddle of the New Testament. London, 1958.
- Howard, W. F. The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation. Revised by C. K. Barrett. 4th ed. revised. London, 1955.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Gospel according to St. John," The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by G. A. Buttrick. Vol. 8. New York and Nashville, Tenn., 1952.
- Jackson, F. J. F., and Lake, K. The Beginnings of Christianity. 5 vols. London, 1920-33.
- Jeremias, J. The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. Translated by N. Perrin. London, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Jesus' Promise to the Nations. Translated by S. H. Hooke. 1st English ed. London, 1958.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Rediscovery of Bethesda. Translation edited by J. Vardaman. (New Testament Archaeology Monograph, No. 1) Louisville, Ky., 1966.

- Johnson, S. E. The Gospel according to St. Mark.  
(Black's New Testament Commentaries) London,  
1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Gospel according to St. Matthew," The  
Interpreter's Bible. Edited by G. A. Buttrick.  
Vol. 7. New York and Nashville, Tenn., 1951.
- Kallas, J. The Significance of the Synoptic Miracles.  
(S.P.C.K. Biblical Monograph) London, 1961.
- Kilpatrick, G. D. The Origins of the Gospel according  
to St. Matthew. Oxford, 1946.
- Klostermann, E. Das Markus Evangelium. (Handbuch zum  
Neuen Testament) 4th ed. Tübingen, 1950.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Das Matthäusevangelium. (Handbuch zum  
Neuen Testament) 2nd ed. Tübingen, 1927.
- Knox, W. L. The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels. 2 vols.  
Cambridge, 1953-57.
- Koch, K. Was ist Formgeschichte? Neukirchen, 1964.
- Köster, H. Synoptische Überlieferung bei den  
apostolischen Vätern. (Texte und Untersuchungen,  
Band 65) Berlin, 1957, pp. 1-274.
- Kümmel, W. G. Introduction to the New Testament.  
Translated by A. J. Mattill, Jr. London, 1966.
- Lagrange, M.-J. Évangile selon Saint Jean. 6th ed.  
Paris, 1936.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Évangile selon Saint Luc. 6th ed. Paris,  
1941.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Évangile selon Saint Marc. 6th ed. Paris,  
1942.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Évangile selon Saint Matthieu. 6th ed.  
Paris, 1941.
- Leaney, A. R. C. A Commentary on the Gospel according  
to St. Luke. (Black's New Testament Commentaries)  
London, 1958.

- Lightfoot, R. H. The Gospel Message of St. Mark.  
London, 1950. This printing, 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_. History and Interpretation in the Gospels.  
London, 1935.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels.  
London, 1938.
- \_\_\_\_\_. St. John's Gospel: A Commentary. Edited by  
C. F. Evans. 1st. ed. Oxford, 1956.
- Ling, T. The Significance of Satan. London, 1961.
- Lohmeyer, E. Das Evangelium des Markus. (Kritisch-  
exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament)  
15th ed. Göttingen, 1959.
- Lohmeyer, E., and Schmauch, W. Das Evangelium des  
Matthäus. (Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar  
über das Neue Testament) 2nd ed. Göttingen,  
1958.
- Loisy, A. Les Évangiles Synoptiques. 2 vols. Montier-  
en-der, 1907-08.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Le Quatrième Évangile. 2nd ed. Paris, 1921.
- Loos, H. van der. The Miracles of Jesus. (Supplement  
to Novum Testamentum, vol. 9) Leiden, 1965.
- McCasland, S. V. By the Finger of God: Demon Possession  
and Exorcism in Early Christianity in the Light  
of Modern Views of Mental Illness. New York,  
1951.
- McGinley, L. J. Form-Criticism of the Synoptic Healing  
Narratives: A Study in the Theories of Martin  
Dibelius and Rudolf Bultmann. Woodstock, Mary-  
land, 1944.
- MacGregor, G. H. C. The Gospel of John. (The Moffatt  
New Testament Commentary) London, 1928.
- McNeile, A. H. The Gospel according to St. Matthew.  
London, 1915.

- Manson, T. W. On Paul and John. Edited by M. Black. (Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 38) London, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Studies in the Gospels and Epistles. Edited by M. Black. Manchester, 1962.
- Manson, W. The Gospel of Luke. (The Moffatt New Testament Commentary) London, 1930.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Jesus the Messiah. London, 1944.
- Marxsen, W. Der Evangelist Markus. 2nd ed. Göttingen, 1959.
- Mauser, U. Christ in the Wilderness. (Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 39) London, 1963.
- Menzies, A. The Earliest Gospel. London, 1901.
- Micklem, E. R. Miracles and the New Psychology: A Study in the Healing Miracles of the New Testament. London, 1922.
- The Miracles and the Resurrection. (S.P.C.K. Theological Collections, No. 3) London, 1964.
- Montefiore, C. J. The Synoptic Gospels. Vols. 1 and 2. London, 1927.
- Moore, G. F. Judaism. 3 vols. Cambridge, Mass., 1927-30.
- Moule, C. F. D. (ed.) Miracles. London, 1965.
- Moulton, W. F., and Geden, A. S. (ed.) A Concordance to the Greek Testament. Edinburgh, 1897.
- Nineham, D. E. Saint Mark. (The Pelican Gospel Commentaries) London, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (ed.) Studies in the Gospels. (Essays in the Memory of R. H. Lightfoot) Oxford, 1955.
- Plummer, A. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Luke. (The International Critical Commentary) 4th ed. Edinburgh, 1901.



- Rawlinson, A. E. J. The Gospel according to St. Mark.  
(Westminster Commentaries) London, 1925.
- Redlich, E. B. Form Criticism: Its Value and Limitations. London, 1939.
- Reitzenstein, R. Hellenistische Wundererzählungen.  
Leipzig, 1906.
- Rengstorff, K. H. Das Evangelium nach Lukas. (Das Neue Testament Deutsch) 6th ed. Göttingen, 1952.
- Richardson, A. The Miracle-Stories of the Gospels.  
London, 1941.
- Riesenfeld, H. The Gospel Tradition and Its Beginnings:  
A Study in the Limits of "Formgeschichte".  
London, 1961.
- Robinson, J. M. The Problem of History in Mark. (Studies  
in Biblical Theology, No. 21) London, 1957.
- Robinson, T. H. The Gospel of Matthew. (The Moffatt New  
Testament Commentary) London, 1928.
- Robinson, W. C., Jr. Der Weg des Herrn: Studien zur  
Geschichte und Eschatologie im Lukas-Evangelium.  
Translated by G. and G. Strecker. (Theologische  
Forschung: Wissenschaftliche Beiträge zur  
kirchlich-evangelischen Lehre, No. 36) Hamburg-  
Bergstedt, 1964.
- Schlatter, A. Der Evangelist Matthäus. 4th ed.  
Stuttgart, 1957.
- Schmidt, K. L. Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu. Berlin,  
1919.
- Schniewind, J. Das Evangelium nach Markus. (Das Neue  
Testament Deutsch) Göttingen, 1952.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Das Evangelium nach Matthäus. (Das Neue  
Testament Deutsch) Göttingen, 1954.
- Schürer, E. A History of the Jewish People in the Time  
of Jesus Christ. 3 divisions. Translated by  
J. MacPherson. Edinburgh, 1885-90.

- Smith, D. M., Jr. The Composition and Order of the Fourth Gospel: Bultmann's Literary Theory. New Haven, Conn., and London, 1965.
- Stendahl, K. The School of St. Matthew. Uppsala, 1954.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (ed.) The Scrolls and the New Testament. London, 1958.
- Strachan, R. H. The Fourth Gospel. 3rd ed. revised and rewritten. London, 1941. This printing, 1960.
- Strack, H. L., and Billerbeck, P. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. 5 vols. München, 1922-28.
- Strathmann, H. Das Evangelium nach Johannes. (Das Neue Testament Deutsch) Göttingen, 1954.
- Strecker, G. Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit. Göttingen, 1962.
- Streeter, B. H. The Four Gospels. London, 1924. This printing, 1961.
- Taylor, R. O. P. The Groundwork of the Gospels. Oxford, 1946.
- Taylor, V. Behind the Third Gospel. Oxford, 1926.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Formation of the Gospel Tradition. London, 1933.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Gospel according to St. Mark. London, 1955.
- Temple, W. Readings in St. John's Gospel. 2 vols. London, 1942.
- Trocmé, É. La formation de l'évangile selon Marc. Paris, 1963.
- Wallace, R. S. The Gospel Miracles. Edinburgh and London, 1960.
- Weinreich, O. Antike Heilungswunder. Giessen, 1909.
- Wellhausen, J. Das Evangelium Johannis. Berlin, 1908.

Westcott, B. F. The Gospel according to St. John.  
2 vols. London, 1908.

Wilder, A. N. Early Christian Rhetoric. London, 1964.

Wiles, M. F. The Spiritual Gospel: The Interpretation  
of the Fourth Gospel in the Early Church.  
Cambridge, 1960.

Wrede, W. Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien.  
Göttingen, 1901.

#### B. ARTICLES

Achtemeier, P. J. "Person and Deed. Jesus and the  
Storm-Tossed Sea," Interpretation, 16 (April,  
1962), pp. 169-176.

Bammel, E. "'John Did No Miracle': John 10.41,"  
Miracles. Edited by C. F. D. Moule. London,  
1965, pp. 179-202.

Barrett, C. K. [Review of Gerhardsson's Memory and  
Manuscript,] J.T.S., 14 (1963), pp. 445-449.

Bartsch, H.-W. "Die 'Verfluchung' des Feigenbaums,"  
Z.N.W., 53 (1962), pp. 256-260.

Birdsall, J. N. "The Withering of the Fig-Tree," E.T.,  
73 (1961-62), p. 191.

Black, M. "Scribe [γραμματεὺς]," I.B.D., vol. 4,  
pp. 246-248.

Boobyer, G. H. "The Eucharistic Interpretation of the  
Miracle of the Loaves in St. Mark's Gospel,"  
J.T.S., n.s. 3 (1952), pp. 161-171.

———. "The Miracles of the Loaves and the Gentiles  
in St. Mark's Gospel," S.J.Th., 6 (1953),  
pp. 77-87.

Borgen, P. "Observations on the Midrashic Character of  
John 6," Z.N.W., 54 (1963), pp. 232-240.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Unity of the Discourse in John 6," Z.N.W., 50 (1959), pp. 277f.
- Braumann, G. "Jesu Erbarmen nach Matthäus," Theologische Zeitschrift, 19 (1963), pp. 305-317.
- Braun, F.-M. "Quatre 'signes' johanniques de l'unité chrétienne," N.T.S., 9 (1963), pp. 147-155.
- Brooks, O. S. "The Johannine Eucharist. Another Interpretation," J.B.L., 82 (1963), pp. 293-300.
- Brown, R. E. "The Gospel Miracles," The Bible in Current Catholic Thought. (In memory of M. J. Gruenthaner) Edited by J. L. McKenzie. New York, 1962, pp. 184-201.
- Burkill, T. A. "The Syrophoenician Woman: The Congruence of Mark 7:24-31," Z.N.W., 57 (1966), pp. 23-37.
- Cadbury, H. J. "Between Jesus and the Gospels," Harvard Theological Review, 16 (1923), pp. 81-92.
- Ceroke, C. P. "The Problem of Ambiguity in John 2,4," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 21 (1959), pp. 316-340.
- Charlier, J.-P. "La notion de signe (σημεῖον) dans le quatrième Évangile," Revue des Sciences philosophiques et théologiques, 43 (1959), pp. 434-448.
- Couchoud, P. L. "Notes sur le texte de St Marc dans le Codex Chester Beatty," J.T.S., 35 (January, 1934), pp. 3-22.
- Cowling, C. C. "The Involvement of the Community in the Apostolic Tradition," The Church Quarterly Review, 164 (1963), pp. 6-18.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. "Gospel of Mark," I.B.D., vol. 3, pp. 267-277.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "St. Mark 9:14-29," S.J.Th., 3 (1950), pp. 57-67.

- Culley, R. C. "An Approach to the Problem of Oral Tradition," Vetus Testamentum, 13 (1963), pp. 113-125.
- Danker, F. W. "Mark 8:3," J.B.L., 82 (1963), pp. 215f.
- Daube, D. "The Earliest Structure of the Gospels," N.T.S., 5 (1958-59), pp. 174-187.
- Dekker, C. "Grundschrift und Redaktion im Johannes-evangelium," N.T.S., 13 (October, 1966), pp. 66-80.
- Derrett, J. D. M. "Peter's Penny: Fresh Light on Matthew XVII 24-7," N.T., 6 (1963), pp. 1-15.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Water into Wine," Biblische Zeitschrift, 7 (1963), pp. 80-97.
- Dodd, C. H. "The Appearances of the Risen Christ: An Essay in Form-Criticism of the Gospels," Studies in the Gospels. Edited by D. E. Nineham. Oxford, 1955, pp. 9-35.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Miracles in the Gospels," E.T., 44 (1932-33), pp. 504-509.
- Dunkerley, R. "Lazarus," N.T.S., 5 (1958-59), pp. 321-327.
- Dupont, J. "Le paralytique pardonné (Mt. 9:1-8)," Nouvelle Revue Théologique, 82 (1960), pp. 940-958.
- Evans, C. F. [Review of Riesenfeld's The Beginnings of the Gospel Tradition,] Theology, 61 (1958), pp. 355-362.
- Farrer, A. M. "Loaves and Thousands," J.T.S., n.s. 4 (1953), pp. 1-14.
- Fenton, J. C. "Destruction and Salvation in the Gospel according to St. Mark," J.T.S., n.s. 3 (1952), pp. 56-58.
- Foerster, W. ἑξουσία, T.W.N.T., vol. 2, pp. 559-571.



- Gibbs, J. M. "Purpose and Pattern in Matthew's Use of the Title 'Son of David'," N.T.S., 10 (1963-64), pp. 446-464.
- Glasswell, M. E. "The Use of Miracles in the Markan Gospel," Miracles. Edited by C. F. D. Moule. London, 1965, pp. 149-162.
- Grundmann, W. δύναμις, T.W.N.T., vol. 2, pp. 286-318.
- Haenchen, E. "Johanneische Probleme," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, 56 (1959), pp. 19-54.
- . "'Der Vater, der mich gesandt hat,'" N.T.S., 9 (1962-63), pp. 208-216.
- Harrisville, R. A. "The Woman of Canaan," Interpretation, 20 (July, 1966), pp. 274-287.
- Harter, W. H. "The Historical Method of Mark," Union Seminary Quarterly Review, 20 (November, 1964), pp. 21-38.
- Heising, A. "Exegese und Theologie der Alt- und Neutestamentlichen Speisewunder," Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie, 86 (1964), pp. 80-96.
- Herbert, A. G. "History in the Feeding of the Five Thousand," Studia Evangelica. Vol. 2. Edited by F. L. Cross. (Texte und Untersuchungen, Band 87) Berlin, 1964, pp. 65-72.
- Hooke, S. H. "Jesus and the Centurion: Matthew 8, 5-10," E.T., 69 (1957-58), pp. 79f.
- Iber, G. "Zur Formgeschichte der Evangelien," Theologische Rundschau, 24 (1957-58), pp. 283-338.
- Iersel, B. van. "Die wunderbare Speisung und das Abendmahl in der synoptischen Tradition," N.T., 7 (June, 1964), pp. 167-194.
- Jeremias, J. "The Copper Scroll from Qumran," E.T., 71 (1959-60), pp. 227f.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Joh 6:51c-58--redaktionell?," Z.N.W., 44 (1952-53), pp. 256f.

\_\_\_\_\_. Μωυσης, T.W.N.T., vol. 4, pp. 852-878.

Johnston, E. D. "The Johannine Version of the Feeding of the Five Thousand--an Independent Tradition?," N.T.S., 8 (1961-62), pp. 151-154.

Kamphaus, F. "Die Wunderberichte der Evangelien," Bibel und Leben, 6 (1965), pp. 122-135.

Karnetzki, M. "Textgeschichte als Überlieferungs-  
geschichte," Z.N.W., 47 (1956), pp. 170-180.

Käsemann, E. "Wunder," IV Im NT, Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Edited by H. v. Campenhausen, et al. Vol. 6. 3rd ed. completely reworked. Tübingen, 1962, pp. 1835-1837.

Keck, L. E. "The Introduction to Mark's Gospel," N.T.S., 12 (1966), pp. 352-370.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Mark 3:7-12 and Mark's Christology," J.B.L., 84 (1965), pp. 341-358.

Klijn, A. F. J. "Scribes Pharisees Highpriests and Elders in the New Testament," N.T., 3 (1959), pp. 259-267.

Knackstedt, J. "Die beiden Brotvermehrungen im Evangelium," N.T.S., 10 (1963-64), pp. 309-335.

Kuby, A. "Zur Konzeption des Markus-Evangeliums," Z.N.W., 49 (1958), pp. 52-64.

Lampe, G. W. H. "The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke," Studies in the Gospels. Edited by D. E. Nineham. Oxford, 1955, pp. 159-200.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Miracles in the Acts of the Apostles," Miracles. Edited by C. F. D. Moule. London, 1965, pp. 163-178.

Lee, E. K. "The Drama of the Fourth Gospel," E.T., 65 (1953-54), pp. 173-176.

- Lee, G. M. "Studies in Texts: Matthew 17:24-27," Theology, 68 (1965), pp. 380f.
- Leroy, H. "Das Weinwunder zu Kana," Bibel und Leben, 4 (1963), pp. 168-173.
- Lindars, B. "Elijah, Elisha and the Gospel Miracles," Miracles. Edited by C. F. D. Moule. London, 1965, pp. 61-79.
- Lövestam, E. "Wunder und Symbolhandlung, Eine Studie über Matthäus 14:28-31," Kerygma und Dogma, 8 (1962), pp. 124-135.
- Luz, U. "Das Geheimnismotiv und die markinische Christologie," Z.N.W., 56 (1965), pp. 9-30.
- McCasland, S. V. "Miracle," I.B.D., vol. 3, pp. 392-402.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Signs and Wonders," J.B.L., 76 (1957), pp. 149-152.
- MacGregor, G. H. C. "The Eucharist in the Fourth Gospel," N.T.S., 9 (1963), pp. 111-119.
- Mánek, J. "Mark viii 14-21," N.T., 7 (March, 1964), pp. 10-14.
- Mead, R. T. "The Healing of the Paralytic--A Unit?," J.B.L., 80 (1961), pp. 348-354.
- Minear, P. S. "A Note on Luke xxii 36," N.T., 7 (March, 1964), pp. 128-134.
- Mollat, D. "La guérison de l'aveugle-né," Bibel et Vie chrétienne, 23 (1958), pp. 22-31.
- Montefiore, H. "Jesus and the Temple Tax," N.T.S., 11 (1964-65), pp. 60-71.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Revolt in the Desert?," N.T.S., 8 (1961-62), pp. 135-141.
- Münderlein, G. "Die Verfluchung des Feigenbaumes," N.T.S., 10 (1963-64), pp. 89-104.

- Neil, W. "Expository Problems: The Nature Miracles," E.T., 67 (1955-56), pp. 369-372.
- Nineham, D. E. "Eye-Witness Testimony and the Gospel Tradition," I, J.T.S., 9 (1958), pp. 13-25; II, J.T.S., 9 (1958), pp. 243-252; III, J.T.S., 11 (1960), pp. 253-264.
- Piper, O. A. "The Origin of the Gospel Pattern," J.B.L., 78 (1959), pp. 115-124.
- Rabinowitz, I. "'Be Opened' = 'Επαθα' (Mark 7:34): Did Jesus Speak Hebrew?," Z.N.W., 53 (1962), pp. 229-238.
- Rengstorff, K. συμπεριφορά, T.W.N.T., vol. 7, pp. 199-261.
- Richardson, A. "The Feeding of the Five Thousand," Interpretation, 9 (April, 1955), pp. 144-149.
- Riesenfeld, H. "Tradition und Redaktion im Markusevangelium," Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann. (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, No. 21) Berlin, 1957, pp. 157-164.
- Riga, P. "Signs of Glory," Interpretation, 17 (1963), pp. 402-424.
- Robin, A. de Q. "The Cursing of the Fig Tree in Mark XI. A Hypothesis," N.T.S., 8 (1961-62), pp. 276-281.
- Robinson, J. A. T. "The Destination and Purpose of St John's Gospel," N.T.S., 6 (1959-60), pp. 117-131.
- Robinson, J. M. "The Problem of History in Mark, Reconsidered," Union Seminary Quarterly Review, 20 (January, 1965), pp. 131-147.
- Ruland, V. "Sign and Sacrament. John's Bread of Life Discourse," Interpretation, 18 (1964), pp. 450-462.
- Sahlin, H. "Die Perikope vom gerasenischen Besessenen und der Plan des Markusevangeliums," Studia Theologica, 18 (1964), pp. 159-172.

- Sawyerr, H. "The Marcan Framework," S.J.Th., 14 (1961), pp. 279-294.
- Schenk, W. "'Den Menschen' Mt. 9:8," Z.N.W., 54 (1963), pp. 272-275.
- Schille, G. "Die Seesturmerzählung Markus 4:35-41 als Beispiel neutestamentlicher Aktualisierung," Z.N.W., 56 (1965), pp. 30-40.
- Schneider, C. μάστιξ, T.W.N.T., vol. 4, pp. 524f.
- Schneider, J. "Der Beitrag der Urgemeinde zur Jesus-Überlieferung im Lichte der neuesten Forschung," Theologische Literaturzeitung, 87 (1962), pp. 401-412.
- Schürmann, H. "Die Verheissung an Simon Petrus," Bibel und Leben, 5 (1964), pp. 18-24.
- Schwartz, E. "Der verfluchte Feigenbaum," Z.N.W., 5 (1904), pp. 80-84.
- Schweizer, E. "Die Heilung des Königlichen, Joh. 4:46-54," Evangelische Theologie, 11 (1951-52), pp. 64-71.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Mark's Contribution to the Quest of the Historical Jesus," N.T.S., 10 (1963-64), pp. 421-432.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Zur Frage des Messiasgeheimnisses bei Markus," Z.N.W., 56 (1965), pp. 1-9.
- Shaw, A. "The Marcan Feeding Narratives," Church Quarterly Review, 162 (1961), pp. 268-278.
- Smith, C. W. F. "No Time for Figs," J.B.L., 79 (1960), pp. 315-327.
- Smith, M. "A Comparison of Early Christian and Early Rabbinic Tradition," J.B.L., 82 (1963), pp. 169-176.
- Stauffer, E. ἐπιτιμία, T.W.N.T., vol. 2, pp. 620-623.



- \_\_\_\_\_. "Zum apokalyptischen Festmahl in Mc. 6:34ff.," Z.N.W., 46 (1955), pp. 264-266.
- Strecker, G. "Zur Messiasgeheimnistheorie im Markus-evangelium," Studia Evangelica. Vol. 3. Edited by F. L. Cross. (Texte und Untersuchungen, Band 88) Berlin, 1964, pp. 87-104.
- Taylor, V. "Mark's Use of Gospel Tradition," Bulletin of the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas, No. 3, (1952), pp. 29-39.
- Taylor, W. S. "Memory and the Gospel Tradition," Theology Today, 15 (1958-59), pp. 470-479.
- Temple, S. "The Two Signs in the Fourth Gospel," J.B.L., 81 (1962), pp. 169-174.
- Tooley, W. "The Shepherd and Sheep Image in the Teaching of Jesus," N.T., 7 (1964), pp. 15-25.
- Torrey, C.C. "The Aramaic Period of the Nascent Christian Church," Z.N.W., 44 (1952-53), pp. 205-223.
- Turner, C. H. "Marcan Usage," J.T.S., 25 (1924), pp. 377-386; 26 (1925), pp. 12-20, 145-156, 225-240, 337-346; 27 (1926), pp. 58-62; 28 (1927), pp. 9-30, 349-362; 29 (1928), pp. 275-289, 346-361.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Textual Commentary on Mark i," J.T.S., 28 (1927), pp. 150-158.
- Tyson, J. B. "The Blindness of the Disciples in Mark," J.B.L., 80 (1961), pp. 261-268.
- Vielhauer, P. "Erwägungen zur Christologie des Markus-evangeliums," Zeit und Geschichte. (Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag) Edited by E. Dinkler. Tübingen, 1964, pp. 155-169.
- Wieand, D. J. "John V.2 and the Pool of Bethesda," N.T.S., 12 (1965-66), pp. 392-404.
- Wilckens, U. "Hellenistisch-christliche Missionsüberlieferung und Jesustradition," Theologische Literaturzeitung, 89 (1964), pp. 517-520.

Wilder, A. N. "Eschatology and the Speech-Modes of the Gospel," Zeit und Geschichte. (Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag) Edited by E. Dinkler. Tübingen, 1964, pp. 19-30.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Form-history and the Oldest Tradition," Neotestamentica et Patristica. Edited by W. C. van Unnik and B. Reicke. (Eine Freundesgabe für Oscar Cullmann, Supplement to Novum Testamentum, vol. 6) Leiden, 1962, pp. 3-13.

Wilkens, W. "Die Erweckung des Lazarus," Theologische Zeitschrift, 15 (1959), pp. 22-39.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Evangelist und Tradition im Johannes-evangelium," Theologische Zeitschrift, 16 (1960), pp. 81-90.

Wilson, R. McL. "Mark," Peake's, pp. 799-819.

## INDEX TO PRINCIPAL PASSAGES DISCUSSED

(The page on which each discussion begins is indicated.)

- The Capernaum demoniac (Mk. 1:21-28; Lk. 4:31-37) 6; 280.  
 Simon's mother-in-law (Mk. 1:29-31; Mt. 8:14f.;  
     Lk. 4:38f.) 13; 157; 287.  
 Healings at evening (Mk. 1:32-34; Mt. 8:16f.; Lk. 4:40f.)  
     17; 159; 290.  
 The leper (Mk. 1:40-45; Mt. 8:1-4; Lk. 5:12-16) 19; 145;  
     298.  
 The paralytic (Mk. 2:1-12; Mt. 9:1-8; Lk. 5:17-26) 25;  
     174; 304.  
 The man with withered hand (Mk. 3:1-6; Mt. 12:9-14;  
     Lk. 6:6-11) 31; 201; 311.  
 The stilling of the storm (Mk. 4:35-41; Mt. 8:23-27;  
     Lk. 8:22-25) 37; 163; 325.  
 The Gerasene demoniac (Mk. 5:1-20; Mt. 8:28-34; Lk. 8:26-  
     39) 41; 168; 330.  
 Jairus' daughter and the woman with the haemorrhage  
     (Mk. 5:21-43; Mt. 9:18-26; Lk. 8:40-56)  
     50; 180; 335.  
 The feeding of the 5000 (Mk. 6:30-44; Mt. 14:13-21;  
     Lk. 9:10-17) 60; 210; 343.  
 Jesus' walking on the water (Mk. 6:45-52; Mt. 14:22-33)  
     67; 218.  
 The Syrophoenician woman (Mk. 7:24-30; Mt. 15:21-28)  
     73; 224.  
 The deaf mute (Mk. 7:31-37) 80.  
 The feeding of the 4000 (Mk. 8:1-10; Mt. 15:32-39)  
     85; 232.  
 The blind man (Mk. 8:22-26) 97.  
 The epileptic boy (Mk. 9:14-29; Mt. 17:14-20; Lk. 9:  
     37-43a) 106; 239; 350.  
 Blind Bartimaeus (Mk. 10:46-52; Mt. 20:29-34; Lk. 18:  
     35-43) 113; 249; 373.  
 The cursing of the fig tree (Mk. 11:12-14, 20-25;  
     Mt. 21:18-22) 120; 254.

The centurion's servant (Mt. 8:5-13; Lk. 7:1-10)  
151; 315.  
The two blind men (Mt. 9:27-31) 188.  
The dumb demoniac (Mt. 9:32-34) 196.  
The blind and dumb demoniac (Mt. 12:22-24; Lk. 11:  
14-16) 207.  
The temple tax (Mt. 17:24-27) 245.

The draft of fish (Lk. 5:1-11) 293.  
The widow's son at Nain (Lk. 7:11-17) 319.  
The woman with a spirit of infirmity (Lk. 13:10-17)  
357.  
The man with dropsy (Lk. 14:1-6) 363.  
The ten lepers (Lk. 17:11-19) 368.

The Cana wedding (Jn. 2:1-11) 398.  
The official's son (Jn. 4:46-54) 407.  
The lame man at the pool (Jn. 5:1ff.) 414.  
The feeding of the 5000 (Jn. 6:1-15) 420.  
Jesus' walking on the water (Jn. 6:16-21) 425.  
The man born blind (Jn. 9:1ff.) 440.  
The raising of Lazarus (Jn. 11:1ff.) 449.